arXiv:1409.0707v1 [math.AP] 2 Sep 2014

On the existence of low regularity solutions to semilinear generalized Tricomi equations in mixed type domains

Ruan, Zhuoping[1,*], Witt, Ingo[2], Yin Huicheng[1,*]

1. Department of Mathematics and IMS, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China.

2. Mathematical Institute, University of Göttingen, Bunsenstr. 3-5, D-37073 Göttingen, Germany.

Abstract

In [19-20], we have established the existence and singularity structures of low regularity solutions to the semilinear generalized Tricomi equations in the degenerate hyperbolic regions and to the higher order degenerate hyperbolic equations, respectively. In the present paper, we shall be concerned with the low regularity solution problem for the semilinear mixed type equation $\partial_t^2 u - t^{2l-1}\Delta u = f(t,x,u)$ with an initial data $u(0,x) = \varphi(x) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ $(0 \le s < \frac{n}{2})$, where $(t,x) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \ge 2$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $f(t,x,u)$ is C^1 smooth in its arguments and has compact support with respect to the variable x. Under the assumption of the subcritical growth of $f(t,x,u)$ on u, we will show the existence and regularity of the considered solution in the mixed type domain $[-T_0,T_0]\times\mathbb{R}^n$ for some fixed constant $T_0 > 0$.

Keywords: Generalized Tricomi equation, mixed type equation, confluent hypergeometric function, modified Bessel functions, Calderón-Zygmund decomposition, multiplier

Mathematical Subject Classification 2000: 35L70, 35L65, 35L67, 76N15

1 Introduction

In [19-20], we have established the existence and singularity structures of low regularity solutions to the semilinear generalized Tricomi equations in the hyperbolic regions and to the higher order degenerate hyperbolic equations, respectively. In the present paper, we have a further

*Ruan Zhuoping and Yin Huicheng were supported by the NSFC (No. 10931007, No. 11025105), and by the Priority Academic Program Development of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions. This research was started when Ruan Zhuoping and Yin Huicheng were visiting the Mathematical Institute of the University of Göttingen in February-March of 2013.

study on the existence and regularities of solutions to the following n-dimensional semilinear generalized Tricomi equation in the mixed type domain $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n$

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t^2 u - t^{2l-1}\Delta u = f(t,x,u), & (t,x)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n,\\ u(0,x)=\varphi(x), & x\in\mathbb{R}^n,\end{cases}\tag{1.1}$$

where $l\in\mathbb{N}$, $x=(x_1,...,x_n)$, $n\geq 2$, $\Delta=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\partial_i^2$, $\varphi(x)\in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ $(0\leq s<\frac{n}{2})$, $f(t,x,u)$ is C^1 smooth in its arguments and has a compact support E on the variable x. Moreover, for any $T>0$, there exists $C_T>0$ such that for $(t,x,u)\in[-T,T]\times E\times\mathbb{R}$,

$$|f(t,x,u)|\leq C_T(1+|u|)^{\mu}\quad\text{and}\quad|\partial_u f(t,x,u)|\leq C_T(1+|u|)^{\max\{\mu-1,0\}}\,,\tag{1.2}$$

where $C_T>0$ is a constant depending only on T, and the exponent $\mu\geq 0$ fulfills

$$\mu<p_0\equiv\frac{2n}{n-2s}.\tag{1.3}$$

Here we point out that the number p_0 defined in (1.3) comes from the Sobolev imbedding formula $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)\subset L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Thus (1.2) and (1.3) mean that the nonlinearity f in (1.1) admits a "subcritical" growth on the variable u. In addition, we shall illustrate that the scope of the exponent μ for solving the problem (1.1) is closely related to the number $Q_0\equiv 1+\frac{n(2l+1)}{2}$. In the terminology of [16] and the references therein, Q_0 is called the homogeneous dimension corresponding to the degenerate elliptic operator $\partial_t^2 u-t^{2l-1}\Delta$ for $t\leq 0$. Our main result in this paper is:

Theorem 1.1. *Under the conditions (1.2)-(1.3), there exists a constant $T_0>0$ such that the problem (1.1) has a unique solution $u(t,x)\in C([-T_0,T_0],L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ when $0\leq\mu\leq 1$, or when $1<\mu<p_0$ and $Q_0\leq\frac{p_0}{\mu-1}$.*

Remark 1.1. *It seems to be necessary that the restriction of $Q_0\leq\frac{p_0}{\mu-1}$ is posed when $1<\mu<p_0$ in Theorem 1.1, otherwise, the standard iteration scheme for solving the problem (1.1) only works in finite steps or the solution $u\notin C([-T_0,T_0],L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ when $Q_0>\frac{p_0}{\mu-1}$. One can see Remark 4.1 and the related explanations below (4.7) in §4, respectively.*

Remark 1.2. *For $l=1$, (1.1) is the well-known semilinear Tricomi equation $\partial_t^2u-t\Delta u=f(t,x,u)$. When an initial data $u(0,x)=\varphi(x)\in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $s>\frac{n}{2}$ is given and the* **crucial assumption** *of $suppf\subset\{t\geq 0\}$ is posed (namely, $f\equiv 0$ holds in $t\leq 0$, which means that the related Tricomi equation is* **linear** *in the elliptic region $\{t\leq 0\}$), M. Beals in [2] shows that the problem (1.1) has a regular solution $u\in C((-\infty,T],H^s(\mathbb{R}^n))\cap C^1((-\infty,T],H^{s-\frac{5}{6}}(\mathbb{R}^n))\cap C^2((-\infty,T],H^{s-\frac{11}{6}}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for some constant $T>0$. Here we point out that the key assumption of $suppf\subset\{t\geq 0\}$ in [2] has been removed as well as the local existence of low regularity solutions is established in our present paper.*

Remark 1.3. *If the initial data $\varphi(x) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $n = 2, 3$ and $s \geq 0$ is given, then we can remove all the assumptions in (1.2)-(1.3). In fact, in this case, from the proof procedure in §4, we can derive that the solution $u(t, x)$ of (1.1) satisfies: $u(t, x), \partial_t u(t, x) \in L^\infty([-T_0, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ for some fixed $T_0 > 0$. Based on this, together with the $L^\infty_{loc}([0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ property of the solution $v(t, x)$ to the linear equation $\partial_t^2 v - t^{2l-1}\Delta v = 0$ with $(v(0, x), \partial_t v(0, x)) = (\varphi_0(x), \varphi_1(x))$, where $\varphi_0(x), \varphi_1(x) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we may show that (1.1) is also solvable in the degenerate hyperbolic region in the space $L^\infty([0, T_1] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ for some positive constant $T_1 > 0$. Combining these two cases, we know that (1.1) is locally solvable (see more detailed explanations in Remark 5.1 of §5 below).*

Remark 1.4. *If the nonlinearity $f(t, x, u)$ in (1.1) increases sublinearly or linearly with respect to the variable u, namely, $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ holds in (1.2), then by a minor modification on the proof of Theorem 1.1, we can obtain a global solution $u \in C(\mathbb{R}, L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ to (1.1).*

Remark 1.5. *In order to guarantee the existence and uniqueness of the solution u to (1.1), the assumption that $f(t, x, u)$ is compactly supported on the variable x is required. Otherwise, in case $f(t, x, u) \sim |u|^{p-1}u$ with $p \geq 1$, due to the the existence of infinite eigenvalues for the Tricomi operator $\partial_t^2 - t\Delta$ with $t \in \mathbb{R}$, (1.1) can admit infinitely many solutions or have no solution (one can see the references [13], [15-16] and so on).*

Remark 1.6. *With respect to the existence, singularity structures, and singularity propagation theories of classical solutions to the semilinear generalized Tricomi equations in the* **degenerate hyperbolic regions/mixed type regions** *or to the higher order* **degenerate hyperbolic** *equations, so far there have been many interesting results (one can see [1-5], [7], [19-20], [25-26] and the references therein). For the linear Tricomi equation in the mixed type region, when the closed boundary value is given, the authors in [14] establish the existence and uniqueness of weak solutions. Here our focus in Theorem 1.1 is on the existence of the low regularity solution to the semilinear problem (1.1) in the mixed type region $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Remark 1.7. *For the linear Tricomi equation $\partial_x^2 u - x\partial_y^2 u = 0$ with an initial data $u(0, y) = u_0(y)$, its solvability in the whole region $\mathbb{R}^2$ has some very important practical applications in the continuous transonic gas dynamics of isentropic and irrotational flows. Indeed, once the solution u is found, one can seek out the corresponding de Laval nozzle walls through its streamlines and then the required position of the sonic curve (corresponding to the lone $\{x = 0\}$ in the hodograph plane) in the de Laval nozzle can be determined (more introductions on this physical background can be found in [12] and so on).*

For $n = 1, l = 1$ and $f(t, x, u) \equiv 0$, the equation in (1.1) becomes the classical Tricomi equation which arises in transonic gas dynamics and has been extensively investigated in bounded domain with suitable boundary conditions from various viewpoints (one can see the review paper [18] and the references therein). For $l = 1$ and $n = 2$, with respect to the equation $\partial_t^2 u - t\triangle u = f(t, x, u)$ with an initial data $u(0, x) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ $(s > \dfrac{n}{2})$, under the crucial assumption of $suppf \subset \{t \geq 0\}$, M. Beals in [2] established the local existence of the solution $u(t, x) \in C((-\infty, T], H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap C^1((-\infty, T], H^{s-\frac{5}{6}}(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap C^2((-\infty, T], H^{s-\frac{11}{6}}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for some $T > 0$, moreover the $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ conormal regularity of u with respect to the characteristic

surfaces $x_1 = \pm\frac{2}{3}t^{\frac{3}{2}}$ was also obtained in [2]. For more general nonlinear degenerate hyperbolic equations with discontinuous initial data, the authors in [19-20] obtained the local existence of low regularity solutions. In the present paper, we focus on the **low regularity solution** problem for the semilinear generalized Tricomi equation with an initial data $u(0,x)$ in the **mixed type region** $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n$.

We now comment on the proof of Theorem 1.1. In order to establish the existence and regularity of the solution to (1.1) with an initial data $u(0,x)=\varphi(x)$, we first consider the linear equation $\partial_t^2 v - t^{2l-1}\Delta v = 0$ with $v(0,x)=\varphi(x)$ in the domain $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n$ and obtain $v(t,x)\in C(\mathbb{R},H^s)\cap C^1(\mathbb{R},H^{s-\frac{4l+1}{2(2l+1)}})$. Subsequently, we set $w=u-v$ and get a second order nonlinear degenerate equation of w from (1.1) in the domain $\{t\le 0\}$. By utilizing some delicate harmonic analysis methods (e.g., Calderón-Zygmund decomposition, interpolation, multiplier, fractional integral, and so on) as in [8-9], we can establish some suitably weighted $W^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ estimates on w and further obtain the solvability of w in $\{t\le 0\}$ by the fixed point principle. From this, one can get another initial data $\partial_t u(0,x)$, which is necessary to solve (1.1) in the degenerate hyperbolic region $\{t\ge 0\}$. Finally by using some techniques in degenerate hyperbolic equations (see [19-20], [25-26] and the references therein), we can establish the solvability and regularity of the solution u to (1.1) in the domain $\{t\ge 0\}$. Then a local solution u in the mixed type domain $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n$ could be obtained by patching the two solutions got in the degenerate elliptic domain and the degenerate hyperbolic domain separately.

This paper is organized as follows. In §2, we will give some preliminary results and useful estimates on the solutions to the linear degenerate elliptic equation $\partial_t^2 u + t^m\Delta u = t^m f(t,x)$ with $u(0,x)=0$ and $f(t,x)\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $m\in\mathbb{N}$ and $t\ge 0$. In §3, we establish more general weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimates of the solutions to the equation $\partial_t^2 u + t^m\Delta u = t^\nu f(t,x)$ in $\{t\ge 0\}$ for $0<\nu<m$. Here we emphasize that such weighted estimates also admit independent interests in the degenerate elliptic equations. Based on the results in §2 and §3, we can show the local existence and regularity of (1.1) in the degenerate elliptic region $\{t\le 0\}$ in §4. Moreover, we may obtain $\partial_t u(0,x)$ from Theorem 4.1 in §4. Together with the initial data $u(0,x)$, we can solve (1.1) locally in the hyperbolic region $\{t\ge 0\}$ in §5, and subsequently complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 in §6.

2 Some preliminaries and $W^{2,p}$ estimates for the inhomogeneous generalized Tricomi equation

In this section, we mainly study the $W^{2,p}$ regularity of the solution $u(t,x)$ to the linear generalized Tricomi equation $\partial_t^2 u + t^m\Delta u = t^m g(t,x)$ with the boundary value $u(0,x)=0$ for $t\ge 0$, $m\in\mathbb{N}$ and $g(t,x)\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ $(1<p<\infty)$. To this end, we require to apply some harmonic analysis tools (e.g., Calderón-Zygmund decomposition, generalized Hörmander's multiplier theorem and so on) and some properties of modified Bessel functions. The so-called modified Bessel function $K_\nu(t)=\int_0^\infty e^{-t\cosh z}\cosh(\nu z)dz$ $(\nu\in\mathbb{R})$ is a solution to the equation $\Big(t^2\frac{d^2}{dt^2}+t\frac{d}{dt}-(t^2+\nu^2)\Big)K_\nu(t)=0$ for $t>0$, moreover, there holds that $\lim\limits_{t\to+\infty}K_\nu(t)=0$

and $\lim\limits_{t\to 0+} t^{\frac{1}{2}}K_\nu(t) = C_\nu > 0$ (one can see more properties of $K_\nu(t)$ in [6], [23] and so on). As in [8-9], set $\lambda(t) = C_{\frac{1}{m+2}} t^{\frac{1}{2}} K_{\frac{1}{m+2}}(\frac{2}{m+2}t^{\frac{m+2}{2}})$ for $t > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then a direct verification yields

Lemma 2.1. *For $t \geq 0$,*
(i) $\lambda(t)$ is a solution to the equation $u''(t) - t^m u(t) = 0$ with $u(0) = 1$ and $u(+\infty) = 0$.
(ii) The equation $u''(t) - t^m u(t) = g(t)$ with $u(0) = 1$ and $u(+\infty) = 0$ has a solution

$$u(t) = -\lambda(t)\int_0^\infty \Big(\int_0^{\min(t,\sigma)} \frac{1}{\lambda^2(y)}dy\Big)\lambda(\sigma)g(\sigma)d\sigma.$$

We now cite the Lemma 2.1 of [8], which illustrates some basic properties of $\lambda(t)$.

Lemma 2.2.
(i) $\lambda(t)$ and $-\lambda'(t)$ are decreasing. *(2.1)*
(ii) $\lambda(t) + |\lambda'(t)| \leq C_M(1+t)^{-M}$ holds for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, where C_M is a positive constant depending on M. *(2.2)*
(iii) $\dfrac{\lambda(a)}{\lambda(b)} \leq (\dfrac{a}{b})^{\frac{1}{2}} exp\Big(\dfrac{2}{m+2}b^{\frac{m+2}{2}} - \dfrac{2}{m+2}a^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)$ when $a \geq b > 0$. *(2.3)*
(iv) There exists a constant $C > 1$ such that $\dfrac{1}{C} \leq \dfrac{|\lambda'(t)|}{\lambda(t)t^{m/2}}$ for all $t > 0$ and $\dfrac{|\lambda'(t)|}{\lambda(t)t^{m/2}} \leq C$ for $t \geq 1$ hold. *(2.4)*

Next we prove the global existence and regularity of the solution to the linear generalized Tricomi equation with an initial data in the whole mixed-type domain $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 2.3. *Consider the problem*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 v - t^{2l-1}\Delta v = 0, & (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n, \\ v(0,x) = \psi(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

where $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $\psi(x) \in H^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ $(\gamma \in \mathbb{R})$, then (2.5) has a solution $v(t,x) \in C(\mathbb{R}, H^\gamma) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}, H^{\gamma - \frac{2l+3}{2(2l+1)}})$.

Proof. At first we study (2.5) in the elliptic region $\{t \leq 0\}$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 w - t^{2l-1}\Delta w = 0, & (t,x) \in (-\infty, 0]\times\mathbb{R}^n, \\ w(0,x) = \psi(x). \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

Taking Fourier transform with respect to the variable x in (2.6) yields

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 \hat{w}(t,\xi) + t^{2l-1}|\xi|^2\hat{w}(t,\xi) = 0, & (t,\xi) \in (-\infty, 0]\times\mathbb{R}^n, \\ \hat{w}(0,\xi) = \hat{\psi}(\xi). \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

By Lemma 2.1.(i), the solution $\hat{w}(t,\xi)$ to (2.7) can be expressed as

$$\hat{w}(t,\xi)=\lambda(-ts)\hat{\psi}(\xi)\quad \text{with } s=|\xi|^{\frac{2}{2l+1}}. \tag{2.8}$$

Then it follows from (2.8) and Lemma 2.2.(ii) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|w(t,\cdot)\|_{H^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n)}=&\|\lambda(-ts)<\xi>^\gamma\ \hat{\psi}(\xi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}\\ \le& C\|<\xi>^\gamma\ \hat{\psi}(\xi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}=C\|\psi\|_{H^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n)}\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_t w(t,\cdot)\|_{H^{\gamma-\frac{2}{2l+1}}(\mathbb{R}^n)}=&\|\lambda'(-ts)s<\xi>^{\gamma-\frac{2}{2l+1}}\ \hat{\psi}(\xi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}\\ \le& C\|s<\xi>^{\gamma-\frac{2}{2l+1}}\ \hat{\psi}(\xi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}\\ \le& C\|\psi\|_{H^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n)}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Thus, we have from (2.9) and (2.10)

$$w(t,x)\in C((-\infty,0],H^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n))\cap C^1((-\infty,0],H^{\gamma-\frac{2}{2l+1}}(\mathbb{R}^n)). \tag{2.11}$$

Next we consider the corresponding degenerate hyperbolic part of (2.5) in the region $\{t\ge 0\}$

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t^2 u-t^{2l-1}\Delta u=0, & (t,x)\in[0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^n,\\ u(0,x)=\psi(x), & \partial_t u(0,x)=\partial_t w(0,x),\end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

where $\partial_t w(0,x)\in H^{\gamma-\frac{2}{2l+1}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ comes from (2.11).

Upon applying Proposition 3.3 in [19], we arrive at

$$u(t,x)\in C([0,+\infty),H^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n))\cap C^1([0,\infty),H^{\gamma-\frac{2l+3}{2(2l+1)}}(\mathbb{R}^n)). \tag{2.13}$$

Combining (2.11) with (2.13) yields that problem (2.5) has a solution $v(t,x)$ satisfying

$$v(t,x)\in C(\mathbb{R},H^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n))\cap C^1(\mathbb{R},H^{\gamma-\frac{2l+3}{2(2l+1)}}(\mathbb{R}^n)),$$

therefore, we complete the proof of Lemma 2.3. □

To get the solvability of the nonlinear problem (1.1), as the first step we intend to solve (1.1) in the degenerate elliptic region $(-\infty,0]\times\mathbb{R}^n$. To do so, we require to derive the weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimate of the solution to the problem $\partial_t^2 w+t^m\Delta w=t^\nu g(t,x)$ $(0\le\nu\le m)$ with $w(0,x)=0$ in $\{t\ge 0\}$ so that (1.1) can be solved by applying the Hardy's inequality and the fixed point theorem (one can see the details in §4 below), where $g(t,x)\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$. In this section, we only treat the case of $\nu=m$, where the $W^{2,p}$ (not weighted $W^{2,p}$) estimate can be derived. Based on this, by the interpolation method we can obtain the weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimates for the general ν (see Theorem 3.1 and its proof in §3 below).

From the equation $\partial_t^2 w + t^m \Delta w = t^m g(t,x)$ with $w(0,x)=0$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 \hat{w}(t,\xi) - t^m |\xi|^2 \hat{w}(t,\xi) = t^m \hat{g}(t,\xi), \quad (t,\xi) \in [0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \hat{w}(0,\xi) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.14}$$

This, together with Lemma 2.1.(ii), yields

$$\hat{w}(t,\xi) = \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{T}(t,\sigma,\xi) \sigma^m \hat{g}(\sigma,\xi) d\sigma, \tag{2.15}$$

where $\hat{T}(t,\sigma,\xi) = \displaystyle\int_0^{\min(t,\sigma)} \frac{\lambda(ts)\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda^2(ys)} dy$ and $s = |\xi|^{2/m+2}$. By (2.15), we have

$$\Delta w = \mathcal{F}_\xi^{-1}\big(|\xi|^2 \hat{u}(t,\xi)\big) = \mathcal{F}_\xi^{-1}\Big(\int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi) \hat{g}(\sigma,\xi) d\sigma \Big), \tag{2.16}$$

here $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi) = |\xi|^2 \sigma^m \hat{T}(t,\sigma,\xi)$. We start to analyze the property of kernel $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ so that the $L^p(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ estimate of Δw can be obtained. To this end, we require to apply a basic result on the L^p boundedness for a class of integral operators, which is established in Theorem 1.1 of [8] (a generalized Hörmander multiplier theorem in Theorem 7.95 in [10]). Suppose that the temperate distribution $K(t,\sigma,x) \in S'(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ ($t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is taken as a parameter) satisfies

(i) For each fixed $(t,\sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$, $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi) = \mathcal{F}_x\big(K(t,\sigma,\cdot)\big)(\xi) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\hat{K}$ is piecewise continuous in (t,σ). (2.17)

(ii) $\displaystyle\sup_{t,\xi} \int_0^{+\infty} |\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)| d\sigma \le C.$ (2.18)

(iii) $\displaystyle\sup_{\sigma,\xi} \int_0^{+\infty} |\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)| dt \le C.$ (2.19)

(iv) Denote by $\Delta(a,b) = (a-b, a+b)$ and $\mathcal{C}\Delta(a, 2^{q+1}b) = \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \Delta(a, 2^{q+1}b)$ for some integer q with $q > n$. For $h(\sigma) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $r > 0$, there exists a constant $C_q > 0$ depending only on q such that for all $|\alpha| \le q$

$$\sup_{\frac{r}{2} \le |\xi| \le 2r} r^{|\alpha|} \int_0^{+\infty} \Big| \partial_\xi^\alpha \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi) h(\sigma) d\sigma \Big| dt \le C_q \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma, \tag{2.20}$$

$$\sup_{\frac{r}{2} \le |\xi| \le 2r} r^{|\alpha|} \int_{\mathcal{C}\Delta(a,2^{q+1}b)} \Big| \partial_\xi^\alpha \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi) h(\sigma) d\sigma \Big| dt \le C_q D_1(a,b,r) \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma, \tag{2.21}$$

and if $\int_0^{+\infty} h(\sigma) d\sigma = 0$, then

$$\sup_{\frac{r}{2} \le |\xi| \le 2r} r^{|\alpha|} \int_0^{+\infty} \Big| \partial_\xi^\alpha \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi) h(\sigma) d\sigma \Big| dt \le C_q D_2(a,b,r) \int |h(\sigma)| d\sigma, \tag{2.22}$$

where $D_i(a,b,r) (i=1,2)$ are some positive functions of a, b, r. Then one has

Lemma 2.4. (See Theorem 1.1 of [8]) *Let (2.17)-(2.22) be fulfilled. Assume that for each compactly supported $f(t,x)\in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^n)$, and for each $\delta>0$, there is a Calderón-Zygmund decomposition*

$$f=f_0+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}r_k,$$

where $\|f_0\|_{L^1}+\sum\|r_k\|_{L^1}\le 3\|f\|_{L^1}$, and $\sup|f_0|\le C\delta$. In addition, for some disjoint cubes $Q_k=\Delta_k(a_k,\tilde{b}_k)\times I_k(x_k,b_k)$, here Δ_k (or I_k) is the interval (or cube) centered at a_k (or x_k) with side-length $2\tilde{b}_k$ (or $2b_k$), assuming that

$$r_k \text{ is supported in } Q_k,\quad \int_{Q_k}r_k dtdx=0,\quad \text{and}\quad \delta\sum|Q_k|\le\|f\|_{L^1}.$$

Moreover, for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$, we also suppose that

$$\sum_{j\ge[-\log_2 b_k]}D_1(a_k,\tilde{b}_k,2^j)+\sum_{j\le[-\log_2 b_k]}D_2(a_k,\tilde{b}_k,2^j)\le C,\tag{2.23}$$

where $C>0$ is a generic positive constant independent of $\delta, f, k, a_k, x_k, b_k$ and $\tilde{b}_k$.

Then the operator K defined by

$$(Kf)(t,x)=\int_0^{\infty}K(t,\sigma,\cdot)*f(\sigma,\cdot)d\sigma$$

is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $p\in(1,\infty)$.

Next we apply Lemma 2.4 to establish the L^p boundedness of Δw in (2.16). For this purpose, we require to verify that the kernel $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)=|\xi|^2\sigma^m\hat{T}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ in (2.16) satisfies (2.17)-(2.22). Here we point out that our analysis for $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ is much more delicate and involved than that for the kernel $\hat{K}_0(t,\sigma,\xi)=|\xi|^2t^m\hat{T}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ in [8]. The main reason is: In the integrals (2.18)-(2.22), the variables t and x are the parameter variable and the integration variable respectively. This brings more troubles in treating the integrals (2.18)-(2.22) of $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ than in treating the corresponding integrals of $\hat{K}_0(t,\sigma,\xi)$ due to the appearance of the integral variable factor σ^m in $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ be defined in (2.16), then*
(a) (2.18) and (2.19) hold.
(b) (2.20) holds for $\alpha=0$, namely, for any $h(\sigma)\in C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^+)$, one has

$$\sup_{\frac{r}{2}\le|\xi|\le 2r}\int_0^{+\infty}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt\le C\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma.\tag{2.24}$$

Proof. (a) Noting that

$$\int_0^{+\infty}|\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)|d\sigma=\int_0^{+\infty}|\xi|^2\sigma^m\Big(\int_0^{\min(t,\sigma)}\frac{\lambda(ts)\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda^2(ys)}dy\Big)d\sigma$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
=&\lambda(ts)\int_0^{ts}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\int_y^{+\infty}\sigma^m\lambda(\sigma)d\sigma \qquad (\text{due to } |\xi|^2=s^{m+2})\\
=&\lambda(ts)\int_0^{ts}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\int_y^{+\infty}\lambda''(\sigma)d\sigma \qquad (\text{due to } \lambda''(\sigma)=\sigma^m\lambda(\sigma))\\
=&1-\lambda(ts)\le C, \qquad (\text{by (2.2)})
\end{aligned}
$$

then (2.18) holds.

In addition, one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{+\infty}|\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)|dt=&\int_0^{+\infty}|\xi|^2\sigma^m\Big(\int_0^{\min(t,\sigma)}\frac{\lambda(ts)\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda^2(ys)}dy\Big)dt\\
=&(\sigma s)^m\int_0^{\sigma s}dy\int_y^{+\infty}\frac{\lambda(\sigma s)\lambda(t)}{\lambda^2(y)}dt.
\end{aligned}
$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\sigma s\ge 2$ (otherwise, the uniform bound of $\int_0^{+\infty}|\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)|dt$ can be easily obtained since $\int_0^{+\infty}|\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)|dt\le 2^m\lambda(\sigma s)\int_0^2\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\int_0^{+\infty}\lambda(t)dt\le C$ holds). In this case, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{+\infty}|\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)|dt=&(\sigma s)^m\Big(\int_0^1+\int_1^{\frac{\sigma s}{2}}+\int_{\frac{\sigma s}{2}}^{\sigma s}\Big)dy\int_y^{+\infty}\frac{\lambda(t)\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda^2(y)}dt\\
\equiv&L_1+L_2+L_3. \qquad (2.25)
\end{aligned}
$$

Next we treat each L_i $(i=1,2,3)$ in (2.25). From (2.1) and (2.2), one has

$$
L_1\le C\lambda(\sigma s)(\sigma s)^m\lambda^{-2}(1)\int_0^{+\infty}(1+t)^{-2}dt\le C. \qquad (2.26)
$$

The boundedness of L_2 and L_3 can be obtained by applying (2.3). Indeed,

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_2\le&(\sigma s)^m\int_1^{\frac{\sigma s}{2}}dy\int_y^{+\infty}(\frac{t}{y})^{\frac12}(\frac{\sigma s}{y})^{\frac12}exp\Big(\frac{4}{m+2}y^{\frac{m+2}{2}}-\frac{2}{m+2}t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}-\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)dt\\
\le&(\sigma s)^{m+\frac12}\,exp\Big(-\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)\int_1^{\frac{\sigma s}{2}}y^{-1}exp\Big(\frac{4}{m+2}y^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)dy\\
&\times\int_y^{+\infty}t^{\frac{1-m}{2}}exp\Big(-\frac{2}{m+2}t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)d(t^{\frac{m+2}{2}})\\
\le&(\sigma s)^{m+\frac12}\,exp\Big(-\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)\int_1^{\frac{\sigma s}{2}}y^{-\frac{m+1}{2}}exp\Big(\frac{2}{m+2}y^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)dy\\
\le&(\sigma s)^{m+\frac12}\,exp\Big(-\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)\,exp\Big(\frac{2}{m+2}(\frac{\sigma s}{2})^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)\\
\le&exp\Big(-C(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)\\
\le&C \qquad (2.27)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_3 &\le (\sigma s)^{m+\frac{1}{2}}\, exp\Big(-\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)\int_{\frac{\sigma s}{2}}^{\sigma s} y^{-1} exp\Big(\frac{4}{m+2}y^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)dy \\
&\quad\times \int_{y}^{+\infty} t^{\frac{1-m}{2}} exp\Big(-\frac{2}{m+2}t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)d(t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}) \\
&\le (\sigma s)^{m+\frac{1}{2}}\, exp\Big(-\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)\int_{\frac{\sigma s}{2}}^{\sigma s} y^{-m-\frac{1}{2}} exp\Big(\frac{2}{m+2}y^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)d(y^{\frac{m+2}{2}}) \\
&\le (\sigma s)^{m+\frac{1}{2}}(\frac{\sigma s}{2})^{-m-\frac{1}{2}} \le C. \qquad (2.28)
\end{aligned}
$$

Substituting (2.26)-(2.28) into (2.25) yields (2.19). (b) It follows from (a) that

$$
\int_0^{+\infty}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt \le \int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|\Big(\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)dt\Big)d\sigma \le C\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma.
$$

Thus (2.20) holds for $\alpha = 0$. □

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ be defined in (2.16), then (2.21) holds for $\alpha = 0$, i.e.,*

$$
\sup_{\frac{r}{2}\le|\xi|\le 2r}\int_{\mathcal{C}\Delta(a,2^{q+1}b)}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt \le C_q P_1(ar^{\frac{2}{m+2}}, br^{\frac{2}{m+2}})\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma, \qquad (2.29)
$$

where $h(\sigma)\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ is supported in $\Delta = (a-b, a+b)$, and $P_1(a,b) = exp\Big(-Ca^{m/2}b\Big)$.

Proof. Obviously, it suffices to establish (2.29) for $q = 0$ if the constant C_q can be shown to be independent of q. Notice that

$$
\mathcal{C}\Delta(a,2b) = \begin{cases} (a+2b,+\infty), & \text{if } a \le 2b \\ (a+2b,+\infty)\cup(0,a-2b), & \text{if } a > 2b, \end{cases}
$$

then in order to estimate the integral $\int_{\mathcal{C}\Delta(a,2^{q+1}b)}$ in (2.29), we require to deal with the integrals $\int_{a+2b}^{+\infty}$ and $\int_0^{a-2b}$ separately.

It follows from a direct computation that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{a+2b}^{+\infty}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt \\
&\le \int_{a+2b}^{+\infty}dt\Big(\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\,|\xi|^2\sigma^m d\sigma\Big(\int_0^{\min(t,\sigma)}\frac{\lambda(ts)\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda^2(ys)}dy\Big)\Big) \\
&= \int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\,(\sigma s)^m\lambda(\sigma s)d\sigma\Big(\int_0^{\sigma s}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\int_{(a+2b)s}^{+\infty}\lambda(t)dt\Big) \\
&\le \int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\,(\sigma s)^{m+1}d\sigma\Big(\int_{(a+2b)s}^{+\infty}\frac{\lambda(t)}{\lambda(\sigma s)}dt\Big) \qquad \text{(by (2.1))}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\le \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|\,(\sigma s)^{m+1} d\sigma \Big(\int_{(a+2b)s}^{+\infty} \big(\frac{t}{\sigma s}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}} - \frac{2}{m+2} t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big) dt \Big) \quad (\text{ by (2.3)})$$

$$\le \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|\,(\sigma s)^{m+\frac{1}{2}}\, exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big) d\sigma \int_{(a+2b)s}^{+\infty} t^{\frac{1-m}{2}}\, exp\big(-\frac{2}{m+2} t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big) d(t^{\frac{m+2}{2}})$$

$$\le \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|\,(\sigma s)^{m+\frac{1}{2}}\, \big((a+2b)s\big)^{\frac{1-m}{2}}\, exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}} - \frac{2}{m+2}((a+2b)s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big) d\sigma$$

$$\le C\big((a+b)s\big)^{\frac{m}{2}+1}\, exp\big(-C(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}(bs)\big) \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma$$

$$\le C exp\Big(-C(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}(bs)\Big) \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma, \tag{2.30}$$

where the positive constant C is independent of a and b.

If $a - 2b \ge 0$, then

$$\int_0^{a-2b} dt \Big| \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi) h(\sigma) d\sigma \Big|$$

$$\le \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|\,(\sigma s)^m \lambda(\sigma s) d\sigma \Big(\int_0^{(a-2b)s} \lambda(t) dt \int_0^t \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \Big)$$

$$\le \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| (\sigma s)^m \lambda(\sigma s) d\sigma \int_0^{(a-2b)s} \frac{t}{\lambda(t)} dt \qquad (\text{by (2.1)})$$

$$= \int_0^{(a-2b)s} t dt \Big(\int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| (\sigma s)^m \frac{\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda(t)} d\sigma \Big)$$

$$\le \int_0^{(a-2b)s} t dt \Big(\int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| (\sigma s)^m \big(\frac{\sigma s}{t}\big)^{1/2} exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2} t^{\frac{m+2}{2}} - \frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big) d\sigma \Big) \quad (\text{ by (2.3)})$$

$$\le C\big((a-2b)s\big)^{\frac{3}{2}} \big((a+b)s\big)^{m+\frac{1}{2}}\, exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2}((a-2b)s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)\, exp\big(-\frac{2}{m+2}((a-b)s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)$$

$$\times \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma$$

$$\le C exp\big(-C(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}(bs)\big) \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma. \tag{2.31}$$

From (2.30) and (2.31), we see that

$$\int_{C\Delta(a,2^{q+1}b)} \Big| \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi) h(\sigma) d\sigma \Big| dt \le C P_1(as,bs) \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma, \tag{2.32}$$

where $P_1(a,b) = exp\Big(-Ca^{m/2}b\Big)\Big)$. Thus, (2.29) obviously holds due to (2.32). □

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ be defined in (2.16), then (2.22) holds for $\alpha = 0$, i.e.,*

$$\sup_{\frac{r}{2} \le |\xi| \le 2r} \int_0^{+\infty} \Big| \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi) h(\sigma) d\sigma \Big| dt \le C P_2(ar^{\frac{2}{m+2}}, br^{\frac{2}{m+2}}) \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma, \tag{2.33}$$

where $h(\sigma) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $supp h(\sigma) \subset \Delta = (a-b, a+b)$, $\int_0^{+\infty} h(\sigma)d\sigma = 0$, *and* $P_2(a,b) = ba^{\frac{m}{2}} + b^2a^m + b^3a^{\frac{3m}{2}}$.

Proof. We will divide the proof of (2.33) into the following three parts:

$$\Big(\int_{a+b}^{+\infty} + \int_0^{a-b} + \int_{a-b}^{a+b}\Big)\Big|\int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt.$$

Part 1. $\int_{a+b}^{+\infty}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt \le Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma$ **holds**

By a direct computation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{a+b}^{+\infty}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt\\
=&\int_{a+b}^{+\infty}\Big|\int_{a-b}^{a+b}\big(\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)-\hat{K}(t,a+b,\xi)\big)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt \qquad (\text{by } \int h(\sigma)d\sigma = 0)\\
=&\int_{a+b}^{+\infty}\lambda(ts)dt\Big|\int_{a-b}^{a+b}h(\sigma)|\xi|^2\Big(\sigma^m\lambda(\sigma s)\int_0^{\sigma}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(ys)} - (a+b)^m\lambda((a+b)s)\int_0^{a+b}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(ys)}\Big)d\sigma\Big|\\
\le&\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}\lambda(t)dt\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m\Big(\lambda(\sigma s)-\lambda((a+b)s)\Big)d\sigma\int_0^{\sigma s}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
&+\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}\lambda(t)dt\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\Big(\big((a+b)s\big)^m-\big(\sigma s\big)^m\Big)\lambda((a+b)s)d\sigma\int_0^{\sigma s}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
&+\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}\lambda(t)dt\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\big((a+b)s\big)^m\lambda((a+b)s)d\sigma\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
\equiv&I_1+I_2+I_3. \qquad (2.34)
\end{aligned}$$

Next we treat each I_i $(i=1,2,3)$ in (2.34). For I_1, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 =&\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m\lambda(\sigma s)d\sigma\Big(\int_0^{\sigma s}\frac{\lambda(\sigma s)-\lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(y)}dy\Big)\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}\frac{\lambda(t)}{\lambda(\sigma s)}dt\\
\le&Cbs\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m\lambda(\sigma s)d\sigma\Big(\int_0^{\sigma s}\frac{-\lambda'(y)}{\lambda^2(y)}dy\Big)\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}\big(\frac{t}{\sigma s}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\times exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}-\frac{2}{m+2}t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)dt \qquad (\text{by (2.1) and (2.3)})\\
=&Cbs\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^{m-\frac{1}{2}}exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)\big(1-\lambda(\sigma s)\big)d\sigma\\
&\times\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}t^{\frac{1-m}{2}}exp\big(-\frac{2}{m+2}t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)d(t^{\frac{m+2}{2}})\\
\le&Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{\frac{1-m}{2}}exp\big(-\frac{2}{m+2}((a+b)s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^{m-\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\times exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)\big(1-\lambda(\sigma s)\big)d\sigma
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq Cbs((a+b)s)^{\frac{m}{2}} \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|\big(1-\lambda(\sigma s)\big)d\sigma \\
&\leq Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}} \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \qquad \text{(by (2.2))}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

Similarly, applying Lemma 2.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 \leq& Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1}\lambda((a+b)s)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\Big(\int_0^{\sigma s}\frac{\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda^2(y)}dy\Big)\Big(\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}\frac{\lambda(t)}{\lambda(\sigma s)}dt\Big) \\
\leq& Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1}\lambda((a+b)s)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\frac{1}{\lambda(\sigma s)}\Big(\int_0^{\sigma s}\frac{\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda(y)}dy\Big)\Big(\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}\frac{\lambda(t)}{\lambda(\sigma s)}dt\Big) \\
\leq& Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1}\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\Big(\int_0^{\sigma s}\big(\frac{\sigma s}{y}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2}y^{\frac{m+2}{2}}-\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)dy\Big) \\
&\times\Big(\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}\big(\frac{t}{\sigma s}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}-\frac{2}{m+2}t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)dt\Big) \qquad \text{(by (2.1) and (2.3))} \\
\leq& Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{\frac{m-1}{2}}\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)d\sigma\Big(\int_0^{\sigma s}y^{-1/2}dy\Big) \\
&\times\Big(\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}exp\big(-\frac{2}{m+2}t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)dt\Big) \\
\leq& Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma
\end{aligned} \tag{2.36}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 =& \big((a+b)s\big)^m\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}\frac{\lambda^2((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(y)}dy\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}\frac{\lambda(t)}{\lambda((a+b)s)}dt \\
\leq& Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^m\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}\big(\frac{t}{(a+b)s}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\times exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2}((a+b)s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}-\frac{2}{m+2}t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)dt \quad \text{(by (2.3))} \\
=& Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-\frac{1}{2}}exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2}((a+b)s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty}t^{\frac{1-m}{2}} \\
&\times exp\big(-\frac{2}{m+2}t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big)d(t^{\frac{m+1}{2}}) \\
\leq& Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

Substituting (2.35)-(2.37) into (2.34) yields the conclusion in Part 1.

Part 2. $\int_0^{a-b}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt \leq Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma$ **holds**

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{a-b}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt\\
=&\int_0^{a-b}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\Big(\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)-\hat{K}(t,a+b,\xi)\Big)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt \qquad (\text{by}\int_0^{+\infty}h(\sigma)d\sigma=0)\\
=&\int_0^{(a-b)s}\lambda(t)dt\Big|\int_{a-b}^{a+b}h(\sigma)\Big((\sigma s)^m\lambda(\sigma s)\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}-((a+b)s)^m\lambda((a+b)s)\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\Big)d\sigma\Big|\\
\le&\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m\Big(\lambda(\sigma s)-\lambda((a+b)s)\Big)d\sigma\int_0^{(a-b)s}\lambda(t)dt\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
&+\lambda((a+b)s)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\Big((\sigma s)^m-((a+b)s)^m\Big)d\sigma\int_0^{(a-b)s}\lambda(t)dt\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
\le&Cbs\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m|\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma\int_0^{(a-b)s}\lambda(t)dt\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
&+Cbs((a+b)s)^{m-1}\lambda((a+b)s)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\int_0^{(a-b)s}\lambda(t)dt\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \quad (\text{by (2.1)})\\
\equiv&II_1+II_2. \qquad (2.38)
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate the term II_1 in (2.38), we will consider the following three cases

Case 1. $(a-b)s\ge 2$

One now has

$$\begin{aligned}
II_1\le&Cbs\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m|\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma\Big(\int_0^1\lambda(t)dt\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}+\int_1^{\frac{(a-b)s}{2}}\lambda(t)dt\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
&+\int_{\frac{(a-b)s}{2}}^{(a-b)s}\lambda(t)dt\int_0^1\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}+\int_{\frac{(a-b)s}{2}}^{(a-b)s}\lambda(t)dt\int_1^{\frac{(a-b)s}{2}}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}+\int_{\frac{(a-b)s}{2}}^{(a-b)s}\lambda(t)dt\int_{\frac{(a-b)s}{2}}^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\Big)\\
\equiv&II_1^{(1)}+II_1^{(2)}+II_1^{(3)}+II_1^{(4)}+II_1^{(5)}. \qquad (2.39)
\end{aligned}$$

We only estimate $II_1^{(1)}$, $II_1^{(4)}$ and $II_1^{(5)}$ since the remaining terms can be treated similarly.

It follows from Lemma 2.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
II_1^{(1)}\le&C(bs)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m|\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma\int_0^1\lambda(t)\frac{t}{\lambda^2(t)}dt \quad (\text{by (2.1)})\\
\le&C\lambda(1)^{-1}\,bs\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m|\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma \qquad (\text{by (2.1)})\\
\le&Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma \quad (\text{by (2.2)}) \qquad (2.40)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$II_1^{(4)}\le Cbs\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m\frac{|\lambda'(\sigma s)|}{\lambda(\sigma s)}d\sigma\int_{\frac{(a-b)s}{2}}^{(a-b)s}dt\int_1^{\frac{(a-b)s}{2}}\frac{\lambda(\sigma s)\lambda(t)}{\lambda^2(y)}dy$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\leq & Cbs\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^{\frac{3m}{2}}d\sigma\int_{\frac{(a-b)s}{2}}^{(a-b)s}dt\\
&\times\int_{1}^{\frac{(a-b)s}{2}}(\frac{t}{y})^{\frac{1}{2}}(\frac{\sigma s}{y})^{\frac{1}{2}}exp\Big(\frac{4}{m+2}y^{\frac{m+2}{2}}-\frac{2}{m+2}t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}-\frac{2}{m+2}(\sigma s)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)dy\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad

Case 3. $1 \le (a-b)s \le 2$

In this case, we have

$$II_1 \le II_1^{(1)} + II_1^{(6)},$$

where $II_1^{(6)} = Cbs \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m |\lambda'(\sigma s)| d\sigma \int_1^2 \lambda(t) dt \int_0^t \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}$.

As in Case 2, one has $II_1^{(1)} \le Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} II_1^{(6)} \le & Cbs \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m |\lambda'(\sigma s)| d\sigma \int_1^2 \frac{t}{\lambda(t)} dt \quad \text{(by (2.1))} \\ \le & Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$II_1 \le Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}} \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \quad \text{for } 1 \le (a-b)s \le 2. \tag{2.45}$$

Combining (2.43)-(2.45) yields

$$II_1 \le Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}} \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma. \tag{2.46}$$

Next we estimate II_2 in (2.38), which will be divided into the following two cases.

Case A. $(a-b)s \ge 1$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} II_2 \le & Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1} \lambda((a+b)s) \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \\ & \times \left(\int_0^1 \lambda(t) dt \int_0^t \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} + \int_1^{(a-b)s} \lambda(t) dt \int_0^1 \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} + \int_1^{(a-b)s} \lambda(t) dt \int_1^t \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \right) \\ \equiv & II_2^{(1)} + II_2^{(2)} + II_2^{(3)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.47}$$

Noting the function $\lambda(t)$ is decreasing, then by (2.1)-(2.3)

$$\begin{aligned} II_2^{(1)} \le & Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1} \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \int_0^1 t\big(\frac{(a+b)s}{t}\big)^{1/2} \\ & \times exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2} t^{\frac{m+2}{2}} - \frac{2}{m+2}\big((a+b)s\big)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big) dt \\ \le & Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-\frac{1}{2}} exp\big(-\frac{2}{m+2}\big((a+b)s\big)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big) \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \\ & \times \int_0^1 t^{1/2} exp\big(\frac{2}{m+2} t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\big) dt \\ \le & Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}} \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \end{aligned} \tag{2.48}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} II_2^{(2)} \leq & C\frac{bs}{\lambda^2(1)}\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1}\lambda((a+b)s)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\int_1^{+\infty}\lambda(t)dt \\ \leq & Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{\frac{m}{2}}\Big((a+b)s\Big)^{\frac{m}{2}-1}\lambda((a+b)s)\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma \\ \leq & Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{2.49}$$

For the term $II_2^{(3)}$, one has from (2.3)

$$\begin{aligned} II_2^{(3)} = & Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1}\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\int_1^{(a-b)s}dt\int_1^t\frac{\lambda(t)\lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(y)}dy \\ \leq & Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-\frac{1}{2}}exp\Big(-\frac{2}{m+2}\big((a+b)s\big)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma \\ & \times\int_1^{(a-b)s}t^{1/2}exp\Big(\frac{2}{m+2}t^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big)dt \\ \leq & Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-\frac{1}{2}}\big((a-b)s\big)^{\frac{3}{2}}\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma \\ & \times exp\Big(\frac{2}{m+2}\big((a-b)s\big)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}-\frac{2}{m+2}\big((a+b)s\big)^{\frac{m+2}{2}}\Big) \\ \leq & Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{2.50}$$

From (2.48)-(2.50), we see that

$$II_2 \leq Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma \qquad \text{for } (a-b)s\geq 1. \tag{2.51}$$

Case B. $(a-b)s\leq 1$

One easily obtains

$$II_2 \leq II_2^{(1)} \leq Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma \qquad \text{for } (a-b)s\leq 1. \tag{2.52}$$

Therefore, it follows from (2.38), (2.46) and (2.51)-(2.52) that the conclusion in Part 2 holds.

Part 3. $\int_{a-b}^{a+b}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt \leq C\Big(bs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}+(bs)^2(as)^m+(bs)^3(as)^{\frac{3m}{2}}\Big)\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma$ **holds**

We have

$$\int_{a-b}^{a+b}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{a-b}^{a+b} \Big| \int_{a-b}^{a+b} h(\sigma)|\xi|^2 \Big(\sigma^m \int_0^{\min(t,\sigma)} \frac{\lambda(ts)\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda^2(ys)} dy - (a+b)^m \int_0^t \frac{\lambda(ts)\lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(ys)} dy \Big) d\sigma \Big| dt \\
&\le \int_{(a-b)s}^{(a+b)s} \lambda(t) dt \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| (\sigma s)^m \Big(\lambda(\sigma s) - \lambda((a+b)s) \Big) d\sigma \Big(\int_0^{(a-b)s} + \int_{(a-b)s}^{\min(t,\sigma s)} \Big) \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \\
&\quad + \int_{(a-b)s}^{(a+b)s} \lambda(t) dt \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| \Big(\big((a+b)s\big)^m - \big(\sigma s\big)^m \Big) \lambda((a+b)s) d\sigma \Big(\int_0^{(a-b)s} + \int_{(a-b)s}^{\min(t,\sigma s)} \Big) \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \\
&\quad + \int_{(a-b)s}^{(a+b)s} \lambda(t) dt \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| \big((a+b)s\big)^m \lambda((a+b)s) d\sigma \int_{\min(t,\sigma s)}^t \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \\
&\equiv III_1 + III_2 + III_3 + III_4 + III_5. \qquad (2.53)
\end{aligned}
$$

We now treat each III_i in (2.53) as follows.

Step 1. Estimate of III_1

By applying Lemma 2.2, one obtains

$$
\begin{aligned}
III_1 =& \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| (\sigma s)^m d\sigma \int_0^{(a-b)s} \frac{\lambda(\sigma s) - \lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(y)} dy \int_{(a-b)s}^{(a+b)s} \lambda(t) dt \\
\le& C\Big((a+b)s \Big)^m \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \left(bs \int_0^{(a-b)s} \frac{-\lambda'(y)}{\lambda^2(y)} dy \right) \left(\lambda((a-b)s) \int_{(a-b)s}^{(a+b)s} dt \right) \\
\le& C(bs)^2 (as)^m \Big(1 - \lambda((a-b)s) \Big) \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \\
\le& C(bs)^2 (as)^m \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma. \qquad (2.54)
\end{aligned}
$$

Step 2. Estimate of III_2

$$
\begin{aligned}
III_2 \le& Cbs \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| (\sigma s)^m |\lambda'(\sigma s)| d\sigma \int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s} \lambda(t) dt \int_{(a-b)s}^t \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \\
&+ Cbs \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| (\sigma s)^m |\lambda'(\sigma s)| d\sigma \int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s} \lambda(t) dt \int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s} \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \\
\equiv& III_2^{(1)} + III_2^{(2)}. \qquad (2.55)
\end{aligned}
$$

If $(a-b)s \ge 1$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
III_2^{(1)} \le& C(bs)^2 \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| (\sigma s)^m |\lambda'(\sigma s)| d\sigma \int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s} \frac{1}{\lambda(y)} dy \qquad \text{(by (2.1))} \\
\le& C(bs)^3 \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| (\sigma s)^m \frac{|\lambda'(\sigma s)|}{\lambda(\sigma s)} d\sigma \quad \text{(by (2.1))} \\
\le& C(bs)^3 \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| (\sigma s)^{\frac{3m}{2}} d\sigma \qquad \text{(by (2.4))}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\leq C(bs)^3(as)^{\frac{3m}{2}}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma \tag{2.56}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
III_2^{(2)} \leq & C(bs)^2\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m|\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}\frac{\lambda(t)}{\lambda^2(\sigma s)}dt \qquad \text{(by (2.1))}\\
= & C(bs)^2\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m\frac{|\lambda'(\sigma s)|}{\lambda(\sigma s)}d\sigma\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}\frac{\lambda(t)}{\lambda(\sigma s)}dt\\
\leq & C(bs)^3\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^{\frac{3m}{2}}d\sigma \qquad \text{(by (2.1) and (2.4))}\\
\leq & C(bs)^3(as)^{\frac{3m}{2}}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.57}$$

If $(a-b)s\leq 1\leq (a+b)s$, then one has by (2.1)

$$\begin{aligned}
III_2^{(1)} \leq & Cbs\int_{a-b}^{s^{-1}}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m|\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma\int_{(a-b)s}^{1}\lambda(t)dt\int_{(a-b)s}^{t}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
& + Cbs\int_{s^{-1}}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m|\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma\int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s}\lambda(t)dt\int_{(a-b)s}^{t}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
\leq & Cbs\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m|\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma + C(bs)^3\int_{s^{-1}}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m\frac{|\lambda'(\sigma s)|}{\lambda(\sigma s)}d\sigma\\
\leq & C\Big(bs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}+(bs)^3(as)^{\frac{3m}{2}}\Big)\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma
\end{aligned} \tag{2.58}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
III_2^{(2)} \leq & Cbs\int_{a-b}^{s^{-1}}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m|\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}\lambda(t)dt\int_{(a-b)s}^{1}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
& + C(bs)^2\int_{s^{-1}}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m\frac{|\lambda'(\sigma s)|}{\lambda(\sigma s)}d\sigma\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}\frac{\lambda(t)}{\lambda(\sigma s)}dt\\
\leq & C\frac{1}{\lambda^2(1)}(bs)^2\int_{a-b}^{s^{-1}}|h(\sigma)|\,(\sigma s)^m\,|\lambda'(\sigma s)|\,\lambda(\sigma s)d\sigma + C(bs)^3\int_{s^{-1}}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^{\frac{3m}{2}}d\sigma\\
\leq & C\Big((bs)^2(as)^m+(bs)^3(as)^{\frac{3m}{2}}\Big)\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.59}$$

If $(a+b)s\leq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
III_2^{(1)} \leq & Cbs\int_{a-b}^{s^{-1}}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m|\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma\int_{(a-b)s}^{1}\lambda(t)dt\int_{(a-b)s}^{t}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
\leq & Cbs\int_{a-b}^{s^{-1}}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m|\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma\int_{(a-b)s}^{1}\frac{t}{\lambda(t)}dt \qquad \text{(by (2.1))}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}} \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma \tag{2.60}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} III_2^{(2)} \leq & Cbs \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m |\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma \int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s} \lambda(t)dt \int_{(a-b)s}^{1} \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \\ \leq & C\lambda^{-2}(1)(bs)^2 \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m |\lambda'(\sigma s)|\lambda(\sigma s)d\sigma \qquad \text{(by (2.1))} \\ \leq & C(bs)^2(as)^m \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{2.61}$$

Combining (2.55)-(2.61) yields

$$III_2 \leq C\Big(bs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}} + (bs)^2(as)^m + (bs)^3(as)^{\frac{3m}{2}}\Big) \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \tag{2.62}$$

Step 3. Estimate of III_3

A direct computation derives that from (2.3)

$$\begin{aligned} III_3 \leq & C\Big(bs\lambda((a-b)s)\Big)\Big(bs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1}\lambda((a+b)s)\Big)\Big(\frac{(a-b)s}{\lambda^2((a-b)s)}\Big) \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma \\ \leq & C(bs)^2(as)^m \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{2.63}$$

Step 4. Estimate of III_4

We have

$$\begin{aligned} III_4 \leq & Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1}\lambda((a+b)s) \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma \int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s} \lambda(t)dt \int_{(a-b)s}^{t} \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \\ & + Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1}\lambda((a+b)s) \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma \int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s} \lambda(t)dt \int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s} \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \\ \equiv & III_4^{(1)} + III_4^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 2.2 and (2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} III_4^{(1)} \leq & Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1}\lambda((a+b)s) \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma \int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s} \frac{bs}{\lambda(t)}dt \\ \leq & C(bs)^2\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1} \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)\frac{\lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda(\sigma s)}d\sigma \\ \leq & C(bs)^2(as)^m \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} III_4^{(2)} \leq & Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1}\lambda((a+b)s)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\Big(\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}\lambda(t)dt\,\frac{\sigma s}{\lambda^2(\sigma s)}\Big)\\ \leq & Cbs\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1}\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)\frac{\lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda(\sigma s)}d\sigma\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}\frac{\lambda(t)}{\lambda(\sigma s)}dt\\ \leq & C(bs)^2(as)^m\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$III_4 \leq C(bs)^2(as)^m\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \tag{2.64}$$

Step 5. Estimate of III_5

One has

$$\begin{aligned} III_5 = & \big((a+b)s\big)^m\lambda((a+b)s)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}\lambda(t)dt\int_{\sigma s}^{t}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\ \leq & \big((a+b)s\big)^m\lambda((a+b)s)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}\frac{2bs}{\lambda(t)}dt\\ \leq & C(bs)^2(as)^m\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{2.65}$$

Substituting (2.54) and (2.62)-(2.65) into (2.53) derives the conclusion in Part 3. Therefore, collecting all the results in Part 1 -Part 3, we have

$$\int_0^{+\infty}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt \leq CP_2(as,bs)\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma, \tag{2.66}$$

where $P_2(a,b) = ba^{\frac{m}{2}} + b^2a^m + b^3a^{\frac{3m}{2}}$. Hence Lemma 2.7 is proved. □

Based on Lemma 2.5-Lemma 2.7, we will show that the function $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ defined in (2.16) satisfies (2.20)-(2.22) for all $|\alpha| \leq q$ with some integer $q > n$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ be defined in (2.16), then (2.20)-(2.22) hold.*

Proof. We now prove (2.20) by induction method. Note that (2.20) holds for $|\alpha| = 0$ by Lemma 2.5. Suppose that for $|\alpha| \leq j < q$

$$\int_0^{+\infty}\Big|\partial_\xi^\alpha\Big(\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big)\Big|dt \leq C_q|\xi|^{-|\alpha|}\int|h(\sigma)|d\sigma \quad \text{for any } h\in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)\ ; \tag{A_j}$$

$$\int_{C\Delta(a,2^{q+1}b)}\Big|\partial_\xi^\alpha\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt \leq C_qD_1(a,b,R)|\xi|^{-|\alpha|}\int|h(\sigma)|d\sigma$$
$$\text{for any } h\in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+) \text{ with } supph\subset\Delta(a,b); \tag{B_j}$$

and

$$\int_0^{+\infty}\Big|\partial_\xi^\alpha\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt\le C_qD_2(a,b,R)|\xi|^{-|\alpha|}\int|h(\sigma)|d\sigma$$
$$\text{for any } h\in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+) \text{ with } supph\subset\Delta(a,b) \text{ and } \int h(\sigma)d\sigma=0. \qquad (C_j)$$

At first, we show (A_{j+1}) holds. Denote $U^{(j+1)}=\partial_\xi^{j+1}\hat{u}(t,\xi)$. Taking ∂_ξ^{j+1} on the two hand sides of the equation $\partial_t^2\hat{u}-t^m|\xi|^2\hat{u}=t^mh(t)$ yields

$$\partial_t^2U^{(j+1)}-t^m|\xi|^2U^{(j+1)}=t^m\Big(C_1\partial_\xi(|\xi|^2)U^{(j)}+C_2\partial_\xi^2(|\xi|^2)U^{(j-1)}\Big), \qquad (2.67)$$

where C_1 and C_2 are some constants. It follows from (2.67) and (A_0) that

$$\int_0^{+\infty}|\xi|^2\,|U^{(j+1)}(t,\xi)|dt\le C|\xi|^{-1}\int_0^{+\infty}|\xi|^2\,|U^{(j)}(t,\xi)|\,dt+C|\xi|^{-2}\int_0^{+\infty}|\xi|^2\,|U^{(j-1)}(t,\xi)|\,dt. \qquad (2.68)$$

This, together with the induction assumption (A_j) and the definition of $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)$, yields (A_{j+1}).

In addition, (B_{j+1}) or (C_{j+1}) can be directly obtained by using (2.68) repeatedly until $j=1$ and combining Lemma 2.6 or Lemma 2.7. Therefore, the proof of Lemma 2.8 is completed. □

Next we show that functions

$$D_1(a,b,r)=P_1(ar^{\frac{2}{m+2}},br^{\frac{2}{m+2}}),\ \ D_2(a,b,r)=P_2(ar^{\frac{2}{m+2}},br^{\frac{2}{m+2}})$$

satisfy the estimate (2.23) for suitable a_k,b_k and $\tilde{b}_k$, where $P_1(a,b)$ and $P_2(a,b)$ are defined in (2.29) and (2.33) respectively.

Lemma 2.9. *For $D_1(a,b,r)$ and $D_2(a,b,r)$ defined above, the estimate (2.23) in Lemma 2.4 holds for a_k,b_k and $\tilde{b}_k$ with $b_k\sim a_k^{m/2}\tilde{b}_k$.*

Proof. For any $f\in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^n)$, one has the standard Calderón-Zygmund decomposition (see Theorem 4 in Chapter 1 of [21]):

$$f=g+\sum r_k$$

such that

$$g(t,x)=\begin{cases}f(t,x), & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+\setminus\cup_kQ_k\\ \dfrac{1}{|Q_k|}\displaystyle\int_{Q_k}f(\theta,y)d\theta dy, & \text{in } Q_k\end{cases}$$

and

$$r_k(t,x)=\Big(f(t,x)-g(t,x)\Big)\chi_{Q_k},$$

where the cube $Q_k=\Delta_k(a_k,\tilde{b}_k)\times I_k(x_k,b_k)$ with $\dfrac{1}{C}\le\dfrac{b_k}{a_k^{m/2}\tilde{b}_k}\le C$ for some positive constant $C>1$ independent of k.

Set

$$D_1(a_k,\tilde{b}_k,r)\equiv P_1(a_kr^{2/(m+2)},\tilde{b}_kr^{2/(m+2)})=exp\big(-Ca_k^{\frac{m}{2}}\tilde{b}_kr\big),$$

and

$$D_2(a_k,\tilde{b}_k,r)\equiv a_k^{\frac{m}{2}}\tilde{b}_kr+a_k^m\tilde{b}_k^2r^2+a_k^{\frac{3m}{2}}\tilde{b}_k^3r^3,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{2^jb_k\geq1}D_1(a_k,\tilde{b}_k,2^j)+\sum_{2^jb_k\leq1}D_2(a_k,\tilde{b}_k,2^j)\\&\leq\sum_{2^jb_k\geq1}exp(-C2^jb_k)+C\sum_{2^jb_k\leq1}\Big(2^jb_k+(2^jb_k)^2+(2^jb_k)^3\Big)\\&\leq C\end{aligned}$$

and Lemma 2.9 is proved. □

Based on Lemma 2.4-Lemma 2.9, we now prove

Theorem 2.10. *Consider the problem*

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t^2w+t^m\Delta w=t^mg(t,x),\quad (t,x)\in[0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^n,\\ w(0,x)=0,\end{cases}\tag{2.69}$$

where $m\in\mathbb{N}$, $g\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$ $(1<p<\infty)$, and $suppg\subset\{(t,x):0\leq t\leq M_0\}$ with $M_0>0$ being some fixed constant, then (2.69) has a unique solution $w\in W^{2,p}([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ for any $T>0$, moreover w satisfies the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\partial_t^2w\|_{L^p(G_T)}+\|\Delta w\|_{L^p(G_T)}+\sum_{j=1}^n\|\partial_{tx_j}^2w\|_{L^p(G_T)}\\&\quad+\|\partial_tw\|_{L^p(G_T)}+\sum_{j=1}^n\|\partial_jw\|_{L^p(G_T)}+\|w\|_{L^p(G_T)}\\&\leq C_{p,T}\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)},\end{aligned}\tag{2.70}$$

where $G_T=[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n$, and $C_{p,T}$ is a generic positive constant depending on p and T.

Proof. By (2.16), we know that the solution u to (2.69) satisfies

$$\Delta w=\mathcal{F}_\xi^{-1}\big(|\xi|^2\hat{u}(t,\xi)\big)=\mathcal{F}_\xi^{-1}\Big(\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)\hat{g}(\sigma,\xi)d\sigma\Big),$$

where $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)=|\xi|^2\sigma^m\hat{T}(t,\sigma,\xi)$. By Lemma 2.5-Lemma 2.9, one knows that $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ satisfies all the requirements in Lemma 2.4. Hence we have from Lemma 2.4

$$\|\Delta w\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}\leq C_p\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}.\tag{2.71}$$

This, together with the equation (2.69), yields

$$\|\partial_t^2 w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \le C_p T^m \|g\|_{L^p(G_T)}. \tag{2.72}$$

By (2.71)-(2.72) and the interpolation theory, we can obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\partial_{tx_j}^2 w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \le C_{p,T} \|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}. \tag{2.73}$$

In addition, by (2.15) we have

$$\hat{w}(t,\xi) = \lambda(ts) \int_0^t \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(ys)} \int_y^\infty \lambda(\sigma s)\sigma^m \hat{g}(\sigma,\xi) d\sigma,$$

which derives

$$\partial_t \hat{w}(0,\xi) = \int_0^\infty \lambda(\sigma s)\sigma^m \hat{g}(\sigma,\xi) d\sigma = \int_0^{M_0} \lambda(\sigma s)\sigma^m \hat{g}(\sigma,\xi) d\sigma$$

and further

$$\partial_t w(0,x) = \int_0^{M_0} \mathcal{F}_\xi^{-1}(\lambda(\sigma s)) * (\sigma^m g(\sigma,\cdot)) d\sigma. \tag{2.74}$$

It is noted that

$$\partial_\xi^\alpha(\lambda(-\sigma s)) = |\xi|^{-|\alpha|}\Big(P_1(\sigma s,\omega)\lambda(-\sigma s) + P_2(\sigma s,\omega)\lambda'(-\sigma s)\Big), \tag{2.75}$$

where $P_j(\theta,\omega)(j=1,2)$ are the polynomials of θ, and smoothly depend on the variable $\omega \in S^{n-1}$. From (2.75), we easily derive that for some integer $q > n$

$$\sup_{t\in[-T,0]} r^{2|\alpha|-n} \int_{\frac{r}{2}\le|\xi|\le 2r} |\partial_\xi^\alpha(\lambda(-ts))|^2 d\xi \le C_q \qquad \text{for all } r>0 \text{ and } |\alpha| \le q. \tag{2.76}$$

Analogously, we have for some integer $q > n$

$$\sup_{t\in[-T,0]} r^{2|\alpha|-n} \int_{\frac{r}{2}\le|\xi|\le 2r} |\partial_\xi^\alpha(\lambda'(-ts))|^2 d\xi \le C_q \qquad \text{for all } r>0 \text{ and } |\alpha| \le q. \tag{2.77}$$

Then it follows (2.76)-(2.77), Hörmander's multiplier theorem (see Theorem 7.95 in [10]), Minkowski inequality and (2.74) that

$$\|\partial_t w(0,x)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C_p M_0^{m+1-\frac{1}{p}} \|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}. \tag{2.78}$$

This, together with (2.72), yields

$$\|\partial_t w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \le \|\partial_t w(0,\cdot)\|_{L^p(G_T)} + \Big(\int_0^T \Big\| \int_0^t \partial_\tau^2 w(\tau,\cdot) d\tau \Big\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}^p \Big)^{1/p}$$

$$\leq CT^{\frac{1}{p}}(\|\partial_t w(0,\cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\partial_\tau^2 w(\tau,x)\|_{L^p(G_T)})$$
$$\leq C_p T^{\frac{1}{p}}(M_0^{m+1-\frac{1}{p}} + T^m)\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}. \tag{2.79}$$

By (2.73) and $w(0,x)=0$, one has from Minkowski inequality, Hölder's inequality and (2.79) that

$$\|w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \leq T\|\partial_t w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \leq C_p T^{1+\frac{1}{p}}(M_0^{m+1-\frac{1}{p}} + T^m)\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}. \tag{2.80}$$

In addition, it follows from $w(0,x)=0$ and (2.73) that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \|\partial_j w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \leq C_{p,T}\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}. \tag{2.81}$$

Combining (2.71)-(2.73) and (2.79)-(2.81) yield (2.70). □

3 Weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimates for the generalized Tricomi equations

In this section, for the later requirements of solving Theorem 1.1 in the degenerate elliptic region, we will establish the weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimates of the solution to the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 w + t^m \Delta_x w = t^\nu g(t,x), \quad (t,x) \in [0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^n, \\ w(0,x) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

where $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, and $0 \leq \nu \leq m$. Here we point out that showing the weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimates for (3.1) also admits independent interests in the study on the linear degenerate elliptic equations.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $g \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$ with $1 < p < \infty$ and $supp(g) \subset \{(t,x) : 0 \leq t \leq M_0\}$ for some $M_0 > 0$, then for any fixed $T > 0$, there exists a generic constant $C_{p,T} > 0$ such that*

$$\|\partial_t^2 w\|_{L^p(G_T)} + \|t^{m-\nu}\Delta w\|_{L^p(G_T)} + \sum_{j=1}^n \|t^{\frac{m-\nu}{2}}\partial_{tx_j}^2 w\|_{L^p(G_T)}$$
$$+ \|\partial_t w\|_{L^p(G_T)} + \sum_{j=1}^n \|t^{\frac{m-\nu}{2}}\partial_{x_j} w\|_{L^p(G_T)} + \|w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \leq C_{p,T}\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $G_T = [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n$. In addition, we have further that $w, \partial_t w \in C([0,T], L^p(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and

$$\|w(t,\cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\partial_t w(t,\cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_{p,T}\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}. \tag{3.3}$$

Moreover, if $1 < p < Q_\nu \equiv 1 + n\big(\frac{2l+1-\nu}{2}\big)$, then $w \in C([0,T], L^{\bar p}(\mathbb{R}^n)), \partial_t w \in L^{\bar p}(G_T)$ with $\frac{1}{\bar p} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{Q_\nu}$, and

$$\|w(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{\bar p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\partial_t w\|_{L^{\bar p}(G_T)} \leq C_{p,T}\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}; \tag{3.4}$$

if $p > Q_\nu$, then $w \in C([0,T], L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)), \partial_t w \in L^\infty(G_T)$, and

$$\|w(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\partial_t w\|_{L^\infty(G_T)} \le C_T \|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}; \tag{3.5}$$

and if $p = Q_\nu$, then $w \in C([0,T], L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)), \partial_t w \in L^q(G_T)$ for any $1 < q < \infty$, and

$$\|w(t,\cdot)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\partial_t w\|_{L^q(G_T)} \le C_{q,T} \|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}, \tag{3.6}$$

Remark 3.1. *When $\nu = 0$ in (3.1), the weighted $W^{2,p}$ or $W^{1,p}$ estimates have been established under variable assumptions on the function $g(t,x)$ and by different methods in [11], [21], and [24].*

Remark 3.2. *By [17] and the references therein, $Q_\nu = 1 + (\frac{m-\nu}{2} + 1)n$ stands for the homogeneous dimension with respect to the operator $\partial_t^2 + t^{m-\nu}\Delta$ for $t \ge 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and then it follows from the "Sobolev's imbedding theorem" and (3.2) that (3.4)-(3.6) hold.*

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Since w is a solution to (3.1), then we have from (2.14)-(2.15) that

$$\hat{w}(t,\xi) = \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{T}(t,\sigma,\xi)\sigma^\nu \hat{g}(\sigma,\xi)d\sigma,$$

where $\hat{T}(t,\sigma,\xi) = \displaystyle\int_0^{\min(t,\sigma)} \frac{\lambda(ts)\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda^2(ys)}dy$ and $s = |\xi|^{2/m+2}$. Thus,

$$w(t,x) = \int_0^{+\infty} T(t,\sigma,\cdot) * \big(\sigma^\nu g(\sigma,\cdot)\big)d\sigma, \tag{3.7}$$

where $T(t,\sigma,x) = \mathcal{F}_\xi^{-1}\hat{T}(t,\sigma,\xi)$. To show Theorem 3.1, as in Theorem 2.10, at first, we require to prove

$$\|t^{m-\nu}\Delta w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \le C\|g\|_{L^p}. \tag{3.8}$$

It is noted that

$$t^{m-\nu}\Delta w = \mathcal{F}_\xi^{-1}\big(t^{m-\nu}|\xi|^2\hat{w}(t,\xi)\big) = \mathcal{F}_\xi^{-1}\Big(\int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)\hat{g}(\sigma,\xi)d\sigma\Big),$$

where $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi) = |\xi|^2 t^{m-\nu}\sigma^\nu \hat{T}(t,\sigma,\xi)$. For notational convenience, we set $\hat{K}_1(t,\sigma,\xi) = |\xi|^2\sigma^m\hat{T}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ and $\hat{K}_2(t,\sigma,\xi) = |\xi|^2 t^m \hat{T}(t,\sigma,\xi)$.

With respect to $\hat{K}_1(t,\sigma,\xi)$, its some crucial properties have been established in Lemma 2.5-Lemma 2.9 of §2. For $\hat{K}_2(t,\sigma,\xi)$, the authors in [8] have shown that it satisfies (2.17)-(2.20) and (2.21)-(2.22) with the quantities

$$D_1(a,b,r) = P_3(ar^{2/(m+2)}, br^{2/(m+2)}), \quad D_2(a,b,r) = P_4(ar^{2/(m+2)}, br^{2/(m+2)}),$$

where

$$P_3(a,b) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } a \le 3, \\ exp(-Ca^{m/2}b) & \text{if } a > 3, \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

and

$$P_4(a,b)=\begin{cases} a & \text{if } a\le 3,\\ a^{m/2}b+a^m b^2+ab^{2/m} & \text{if } a>3.\end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

We now prove that $\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)$ satisfies (2.17)-(2.20) and (2.21)-(2.22) with suitable quantities $D_1(a,b,r)$ and $D_2(a,b,r)$. Notice that

$$y^{m-\nu}\sigma^{\nu}\le\begin{cases} y^m & \text{if } \sigma\le y,\\ \sigma^m & \text{if } y\le\sigma,\end{cases}$$

then one has $0\le\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)\le\hat{K}_1(t,\sigma,\xi)+\hat{K}_2(t,\sigma,\xi)$. From this, we have

$$\sup_{t,\xi}\int_0^{+\infty}|\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)|d\sigma\le\sup_{t,\xi}\int_0^{+\infty}|\hat{K}_1(t,\sigma,\xi)|d\sigma+\sup_{t,\xi}\int_0^{+\infty}|\hat{K}_2(t,\sigma,\xi)|d\sigma\le C, \tag{3.11}$$

$$\sup_{\sigma,\xi}\int_0^{+\infty}|\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)|d\sigma\le\sup_{\sigma,\xi}\int_0^{+\infty}|\hat{K}_1(t,\sigma,\xi)|dt+\sup_{\sigma,\xi}\int_0^{+\infty}|\hat{K}_2(t,\sigma,\xi)|dt\le C, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{+\infty}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt&\le\int_0^{+\infty}dt\int_0^{+\infty}\Big(\hat{K}_1(t,\sigma,\xi)+\hat{K}_2(t,\sigma,\xi)\Big)|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\\&\le C\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{C\Delta(a,2^{q+1}b)}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt\\&\le\int_{C\Delta(a,2^{q+1}b)}dt\int_0^{+\infty}\Big(\hat{K}_1(t,\sigma,\xi)+\hat{K}_2(t,\sigma,\xi)\Big)|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\\&\le C\Big(P_1(as,bs)+P_3(as,bs)\Big)\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma,\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

which means that $\hat{K}$ satisfies the estimates (2.18)-(2.19), and (2.20)-(2.21) with $\alpha=0$.

Next we verify the estimate (2.22) of $\hat{K}$ when $|\alpha|=0$. This procedure will be divided into the following three parts. From now on, we assume that the function $h\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ with $\int h(\sigma)d\sigma=0$ is supported in $\Delta(a,b)$.

Part 1. $\int_{a+b}^{+\infty}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt\le CP_5(as,bs)\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma$ **holds for suitable function** $P_5(a,b)$

It follows from a direct computation that

$$\int_{a+b}^{+\infty}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{a+b}^{+\infty} \Big| \int_{a-b}^{a+b} \big(\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi) - \hat{K}(t,a+b,\xi)\big) h(\sigma) d\sigma \Big| dt \qquad \Big(\text{by} \int h(\sigma)d\sigma = 0\Big) \\
&= \int_{a+b}^{+\infty} \Big| \int_{a-b}^{a+b} h(\sigma)|\xi|^2 t^{m-\nu} \Big(\sigma^{\nu} \int_0^{\min(t,\sigma)} \frac{\lambda(ts)\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda^2(ys)} dy \\
&\qquad\qquad - (a+b)^{\nu} \int_0^{\min(t,a+b)} \frac{\lambda(ts)\lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(ys)} dy \Big) d\sigma \Big| dt \\
&\le \int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty} \lambda(t) dt \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|\, t^m \Big(\lambda(\sigma s) - \lambda((a+b)s) \Big) d\sigma \int_0^{\sigma s} \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \\
&\quad + \int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty} \lambda(t) dt \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|\, t^{m-\nu} \Big(\big((a+b)s\big)^{\nu} - \big(\sigma s\big)^{\nu} \Big) \lambda((a+b)s) d\sigma \int_0^{\sigma s} \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \\
&\quad + \int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty} \lambda(t) dt \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|\, t^m \lambda((a+b)s) d\sigma \int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s} \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \\
&\equiv I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \qquad (3.15)
\end{aligned}
$$

Next we treat all the I_i $(1 \le i \le 3)$ in the distinct two cases.

Case 1. $as \ge 1$

In this case, we arrive at

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_1 \le & |\lambda'((a+b)s)| \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \int_0^{(a+b)s} \frac{\lambda(\sigma s) - \lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(y)} dy \qquad (\text{by } t^m\lambda(t) = \lambda''(t)) \\
\le & Cbs |\lambda'((a+b)s)| \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \int_0^{(a+b)s} \frac{-\lambda'(y)}{\lambda^2(y)} dy \qquad (\text{ by (2.1) }) \\
= & Cbs \frac{|\lambda'((a+b)s)|}{\lambda((a+b)s)} \Big(1 - \lambda((a+b)s)\Big) \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \\
\le & Cbs (as)^{\frac{m}{2}} \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \qquad (3.16)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_2 \le & Cbs \big((a+b)s\big)^{\nu-1} \lambda((a+b)s) \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| \frac{\sigma s}{\lambda^2(\sigma s)} d\sigma \int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty} t^{m-\nu} \lambda(t) dt \\
\le & Cbs \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| \frac{\lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(\sigma s)} d\sigma \int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty} t^m \lambda(t) dt \\
= & Cbs \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| \frac{|\lambda'((a+b)s)|\, \lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(\sigma s)} d\sigma \\
\le & Cbs \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| \frac{|\lambda'((a+b)s)|}{\lambda((a+b)s)} \frac{\lambda^2((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(\sigma s)} d\sigma \\
\le & Cbs (as)^{\frac{m}{2}} \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \qquad (3.17)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 \leq & C\frac{bs}{\lambda((a+b)s)}\int_{(a+b)s}^{+\infty} t^m\lambda(t)dt\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma \qquad \text{(by (2.1))} \\ = & Cbs\frac{|\lambda'((a+b)s)|}{\lambda((a+b)s)}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma \\ \leq & Cbs(as)^{\frac{m}{2}}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \qquad \text{(by (2.2))} \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Case 2. $as \leq 1$

Denote by $H = \int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\lambda(\sigma s)d\sigma\int_0^{\sigma s}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\int_y^{+\infty}t^m\lambda(t)dt$. Then a direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} H = & \int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\lambda(\sigma s)d\sigma\int_0^{\sigma s}\frac{-\lambda'(y)}{\lambda^2(y)}dy \qquad (\text{ since } t^m\lambda(t) = \lambda''(t)) \\ = & \int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\Big(\lambda(0)-\lambda(\sigma s)\Big)d\sigma \\ \leq & (a+b)s|\lambda'(0)|\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma \qquad (\text{ by (2.1) }) \\ \leq & Cas\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$I_1 \leq H \leq Cas\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma, \qquad I_2 \leq H \leq Cas\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \tag{3.19}$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 \leq & \int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\ \lambda((a+b)s)d\sigma\int_0^{(a+b)s}\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\int_y^{+\infty}t^m\lambda(t)dt \\ = & \int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\lambda((a+b)s)d\sigma\int_0^{(a+b)s}\frac{-\lambda'(y)}{\lambda^2(y)}dy \\ \leq & Cas\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Substituting (3.16)-(3.20) into (3.15) yields

$$\int_{a+b}^{+\infty}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt \leq CP_5(as,bs)\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma, \tag{3.21}$$

where

$$P_5(a,b) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } a \leq 1 \\ ba^{m/2} & \text{if } a \geq 1 \end{cases} \tag{3.22}$$

Part 2. $\int_0^{a-b}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt\le Cbs(as)^{m/2}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma$ **holds**

It follows from a direct computation that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{a-b}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt\\
=&\int_0^{a-b}t^{m-\nu}\lambda(ts)dt\Big|\int_{a-b}^{a+b}h(\sigma)|\xi|^2\Big(\sigma^\nu\int_0^t\frac{\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda^2(ys)}dy-(a+b)^\nu\int_0^t\frac{\lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(ys)}dy\Big)d\sigma\Big|\\
=&\int_0^{(a-b)s}t^{m-\nu}\lambda(t)dt\Big|\int_{a-b}^{a+b}h(\sigma)\Big((\sigma s)^\nu\lambda(\sigma s)\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}-((a+b)s)^\nu\lambda((a+b)s)\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\Big)d\sigma\Big|\\
\le&\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\,(\sigma s)^m\Big(\lambda(\sigma s)-\lambda((a+b)s)\Big)d\sigma\int_0^{(a-b)s}\lambda(t)dt\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
&+\lambda((a+b)s)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\Big((\sigma s)^\nu-((a+b)s)^\nu\Big)d\sigma\int_0^{(a-b)s}t^{m-\nu}\lambda(t)dt\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
\le&Cbs\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m|\lambda'(\sigma s)|d\sigma\int_0^{(a-b)s}\lambda(t)dt\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
&+Cbs((a+b)s)^{m-1}\lambda((a+b)s)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\int_0^{(a-b)s}\lambda(t)dt\int_0^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\qquad\text{(by (2.1))}\\
\le&Cbs(as)^{m/2}\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma.\qquad\text{(as in (2.38))}
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.23}
$$

Part 3. $\int_{a-b}^{a+b}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt\le C(bs)^2(as)^m\int_0^{+\infty}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma$ **holds**

We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{a-b}^{a+b}\Big|\int_0^{+\infty}\hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma\Big|dt\\
=&\int_{a-b}^{a+b}\Big|\int_{a-b}^{a+b}h(\sigma)|\xi|^2\,t^{m-\nu}\Big(\sigma^\nu\int_0^{\min(t,\sigma)}\frac{\lambda(ts)\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda^2(ys)}dy-(a+b)^\nu\int_0^t\frac{\lambda(ts)\lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(ys)}dy\Big)d\sigma\Big|dt\\
\le&\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|(\sigma s)^m\Big(\lambda(\sigma s)-\lambda((a+b)s)\Big)d\sigma\int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s}\lambda(t)dt\Big(\int_0^{(a-b)s}+\int_{(a-b)s}^t\Big)\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
&+\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\Big(\lambda(\sigma s)-\lambda((a+b)s)\Big)d\sigma\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}t^m\lambda(t)dt\Big(\int_0^{(a-b)s}+\int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s}\Big)\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
&+\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\Big(\big((a+b)s\big)^\nu-\big(\sigma s\big)^\nu\Big)\lambda((a+b)s)d\sigma\int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s}t^{m-\nu}\lambda(t)dt\Big(\int_0^{(a-b)s}+\int_{(a-b)s}^t\Big)\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
&+\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|\Big(\big((a+b)s\big)^\nu-\big(\sigma s\big)^\nu\Big)\lambda((a+b)s)d\sigma\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}t^{m-\nu}\lambda(t)dt\Big(\int_0^{(a-b)s}+\int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s}\Big)\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}\\
&+\lambda((a+b)s)\int_{a-b}^{a+b}|h(\sigma)|d\sigma\int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s}t^m\lambda(t)dt\int_{\sigma s}^t\frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\equiv III_1 + III_2 + V_1 + V_2 + V_3 + V_3 + V_4 + V_5 + V_6 + V_7, \tag{3.24}$$

where III_1 and III_2 have been defined in (2.53), whose estimates have been established in (2.54) and (2.62) respectively. Next we treat each V_i ($1 \le i \le 7$). For the term V_1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_1 \le & \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \int_{(a-b)s}^{(a+b)s} t^m \lambda(t) dt \int_0^{(a-b)s} \frac{\lambda(\sigma s) - \lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(y)} dy \\
\le & Cbs \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \int_{(a-b)s}^{(a+b)s} t^m \lambda(t) dt \int_0^{(a-b)s} \frac{-\lambda'(y)}{\lambda^2(y)} dy \\
\le & C(bs)^2 \big((a+b)s\big)^m \lambda((a-b)s) \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \Big(\frac{1}{\lambda((a-b)s)} - 1 \Big) \qquad \text{(by (2.1))} \\
\le & C(bs)^2 (as)^m \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

For the term V_2,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_2 = & \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s} t^m \lambda(t) dt \int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s} \frac{\lambda(\sigma s) - \lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda^2(y)} dy \\
\le & C(bs)^2 \big((a+b)s\big)^m \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| \, \lambda(\sigma s) d\sigma \int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s} \frac{-\lambda'(y)}{\lambda^2(y)} dy \\
= & C(bs)^2 \big((a+b)s\big)^m \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| \, \lambda(\sigma s) \Big(\frac{1}{\lambda(\sigma s)} - \frac{1}{\lambda((a-b)s)} \Big) d\sigma \\
\le & C(bs)^2 (as)^m \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

For the term V_3,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_3 \le & Cbs \big((a+b)s\big)^{\nu-1} \lambda((a+b)s) \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \, \Big(bs \, (\sigma s)^{m-\nu} \lambda((a-b)s) \Big) \, \Big(\frac{(a-b)s}{\lambda^2((a-b)s)} \Big) \\
\le & C(bs)^2 \big((a+b)s\big)^m \frac{\lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda((a-b)s)} \int |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \\
\le & C(bs)^2 (as)^m \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

For the term V_4,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_4 \le & Cbs \big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1} \lambda((a+b)s) \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s} \lambda(t) dt \int_{((a-b)s)}^{t} \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(y)} \\
\le & Cbs \big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1} \lambda((a+b)s) \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| d\sigma \int_{(a-b)s}^{\sigma s} \frac{bs}{\lambda(t)} dt \\
\le & C(bs)^2 \big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1} \int_{a-b}^{a+b} \sigma s |h(\sigma)| \frac{\lambda((a+b)s)}{\lambda(\sigma s)} d\sigma
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C(bs)^2(as)^m \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \tag{3.28}$$

For the term V_5,

$$\begin{aligned} V_5 \leq & C(bs)^2\big((a+b)s\big)^m \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)| \frac{\lambda((a+b)s)\lambda(\sigma s)}{\lambda^2((a-b)s)} d\sigma \qquad \text{(by (2.1))} \\ \leq & C(bs)^2(as)^m \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

For the term V_6,

$$\begin{aligned} V_6 \leq & C(bs)^2\big((a+b)s\big)^{m-1} \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|\lambda((a+b)s) \frac{\sigma s}{\lambda(\sigma s)} d\sigma \qquad \text{(by (2.1))} \\ \leq & C(bs)^2(as)^m \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

Finally, for the term V_7,

$$\begin{aligned} V_7 \leq & Cbs\lambda((a+b)s) \int_{a-b}^{a+b} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma \int_{\sigma s}^{(a+b)s} \frac{t^m}{\lambda(t)} dt \\ \leq & C(bs)^2\big((a+b)s\big)^m \int |h(\sigma)|d\sigma \\ \leq & C(bs)^2(as)^m \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

Collecting (3.24)-(3.31) yields

$$\int_{a-b}^{a+b} \Big| \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma \Big| dt \leq C(bs)^2(as)^m \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma.$$

Thus, by Part 1-Part 3, we arrive at

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \Big| \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{K}(t,\sigma,\xi)h(\sigma)d\sigma \Big| dt \leq CP_6(as,bs) \int_0^{+\infty} |h(\sigma)|d\sigma, \tag{3.32}$$

where

$$P_6(a,b) = P_5(a,b) + ba^{m/2} + b^2a^m.$$

Therefore, $\hat{K}$ satisfies the estimate (2.12) for $|\alpha| = 0$. Applying the similar arguments as done in Lemma 2.8, we can obtain that $\hat{K}$ satisfies estimates (2.20)-(2.22) for any $|\alpha| \geq 0$ by induction method.

In addition, it is easy to know that (2.23) holds for suitably chosen a_k, b_k and $\tilde{b}_k$ with $b_k \sim a_k^{m/2}\tilde{b}_k$ when we set $D_1(a,b,r) = P_1(ar^{2/(m+2)}, br^{2/(m+2)}) + P_3(ar^{2/(m+2)}, br^{2/(m+2)})$ and $D_2(a,b,r) = P_6(ar^{2/(m+2)}, br^{2/(m+2)})$.

Hence, applying Lemma 2.4 we could get

$$\|t^{m-\nu}\Delta w\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)} \le C_p\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}, \tag{3.33}$$

and then as arguing in Theorem 2.10, we have

$$\|\partial_t^2 w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \le C_p T^\nu \|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}, \qquad \sum_{j=1}^n \|t^{\frac{m-\nu}{2}}\partial^2_{tx_j} w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \le C_{p,T}\|g\|_{L^p}. \tag{3.34}$$

Note that from (3.3)

$$\hat{w}(t,\xi) = \lambda(ts)\int_0^t \frac{dy}{\lambda^2(ys)}\int_y^\infty \lambda(\sigma s)\sigma^\nu \hat{g}(\sigma,\xi)d\sigma,$$

which derives

$$\partial_t\hat{w}(0,\xi) = \int_0^\infty \lambda(\sigma s)\sigma^\nu\hat{g}(\sigma,\xi)d\sigma = \int_0^{M_0} \lambda(\sigma s)\sigma^\nu\hat{g}(\sigma,\xi)d\sigma.$$

Thus,

$$\partial_t w(0,x) = \int_0^{M_0} \mathcal{F}_\xi^{-1}(\lambda(\sigma s)) * (\sigma^\nu g(\sigma,\cdot))d\sigma,$$

and $\|\partial_t w(0,x)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C_p M_0^{\nu+1-\frac{1}{p}}\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}$ holds as in the proof of Theorem 2.10. Together with (3.34), this yields for $0 \le t \le T$

$$\|\partial_t w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \le C_p T^{\frac{1}{p}}(M_0^{\nu+1-\frac{1}{p}} + T^\nu)\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)} \tag{3.35}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_t w(t,\cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\le \|\partial_t w(0,\cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \int_0^t \|\partial_\tau^2 w(\tau,\cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}d\tau \\
&\le C_p M_0^{\nu+1-\frac{1}{p}}\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)} + T^{1-\frac{1}{p}}\|\partial_\tau^2 w(\tau,x)\|_{L^p(G_T)} \\
&\le C_p(M_0^{\nu+1-\frac{1}{p}} + T^{\nu+1-\frac{1}{p}})\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

From (3.35)-(3.36) and $w(0,x)=0$, one has

$$\begin{cases}
\|w(t,\cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C_p T(M_0^{\nu+1-\frac{1}{p}} + T^{\nu+1-\frac{1}{p}})\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}, \\
\|w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \le C_p T^{1+\frac{1}{p}}(M_0^{\nu+1-\frac{1}{p}} + T^\nu)\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}.
\end{cases} \tag{3.37}$$

In addition, it follows from $w(0,x)=0$, (3.34) and Hardy's inequality that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \|t^{\frac{m-\nu}{2}}\partial_j w\|_{L^p(G_T)} \le C_{p,T}\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}. \tag{3.38}$$

Combining (3.33)-(3.38) yields (3.2)-(3.3). In addition, (3.4)-(3.6) can be derived as indicated in Remark 3.2. □

4 Solvability of (1.1) in the degenerate elliptic region $\{t \le 0\}$

In this section, we will establish the solvability and regularity of problem (1.1) in the degenerate elliptic region $\{t \le 0\}$ by applying the weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimates given in Theorem 3.1. Our main result is:

Theorem 4.1. *Under the assumptions (1.2)-(1.3), there exists a constant $T_0 > 0$ such that when $0 \le \mu \le 1$, or when $1 < \mu < p_0$ with $Q_0 \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu - 1}$, the following degenerate elliptic equation*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 u - t^{2l-1}\Delta u = f(t,x,u), & (t,x) \in (-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u(0,x) = \varphi(x) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n), \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

has a unique local solution u satisfying

$$u(t,x) \in C\Big([-T_0, 0], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)\Big), \;\; \partial_t u(t,x) \in C\Big([-T_0, 0], L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)\Big), \tag{4.2}$$

where $0 \le s < \dfrac{n}{2}$, $p_0 = \dfrac{2n}{n-2s}$, and $\dfrac{1}{p_1} = \dfrac{1}{2} - \dfrac{1}{n}\big(s - \dfrac{2}{2l+1}\big)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mu \ne 0$. Let $\bar{u}(t,x)$ be a solution to the following linear problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 \bar{u} - t^{2l-1}\Delta \bar{u} = 0, & (t,x) \in (-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \bar{u}(0,x) = \varphi(x) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

Then from (2.11), we have

$$\bar{u}(t,x) \in C((-\infty, 0], H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap C^1((-\infty, 0], H^{s - \frac{2}{2l+1}}(\mathbb{R}^n)),$$

which, together with Sobolev's embedding theorem, yields

$$\bar{u}(t,x) \in C((-\infty, 0], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap C^1((-\infty, 0], L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)). \tag{4.3}$$

Choosing a smooth function $\chi(t)$ such that $\chi(t) \equiv 1$ for $t \ge -1$ and $\chi(t) \equiv 0$ for $t \le -2$. For suitably small fixed constant $T_0 > 0$, we set $\chi_{T_0}(t) = \chi(\dfrac{t}{T_0})$. Let $\bar{u}_{T_0}$ be a solution to the linear equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 \bar{u}_{T_0} - t^{2l-1}\Delta \bar{u}_{T_0} = \chi_{T_0}(t) f(t,x,\bar{u}), & (t,x) \in (-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \bar{u}_{T_0}(0,x) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

Due to the compact support property of $f(t,x,\bar{u})$ on the variable x and the regularity of $\bar{u}(t,x)$ in (4.3), one has from (1.2) that $\chi_{T_0}(t) f(t,x,\bar{u}) \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-)$, here $1 < p \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_- = \{(t,x) : t \le 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$. Next we derive the regularity of $\bar{u}_{T_0}$ by applying the weighted $W^{2,p}$

estimates in Theorem 3.1. Its regularity will depend on the relationship between $\frac{p_0}{\mu}$ and Q_0. Precisely,

Case A. $1 < \frac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0$

We have from (3.3) and (3.4) that for any $1 < p \le \frac{p_0}{\mu}$

$$\bar{u}_{T_0} \in C\big([-T_0, 0], L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)\big), \quad \partial_t \bar{u}_{T_0} \in C\big([-T_0, 0], L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)\big) \cap L^{p_2}(G_{T_0}), \quad (4.5)$$

where $\frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{\mu}{p_0} - \frac{1}{Q_0}$.

Case B. $\frac{p_0}{\mu} > Q_0$

We have from (3.3) and (3.5) that for any $1 < p \le \frac{p_0}{\mu}$

$$\bar{u}_{T_0} \in C\big([-T_0, 0], L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)\big), \quad \partial_t \bar{u}_{T_0} \in C\big([-T_0, 0], L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)\big) \cap L^{\infty}(G_{T_0}),$$

which means that for any $1 < q < \infty$

$$\bar{u}_{T_0} \in C\big([-T_0, 0], L^q(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)\big), \quad \partial_t \bar{u}_{T_0} \in C\big([-T_0, 0], L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)\big) \cap L^{\infty}(G_{T_0}). \quad (4.6)$$

Case C. $\frac{p_0}{\mu} = Q_0$

We have from (3.3) and (3.6) that for any $1 < p < \infty$

$$\bar{u}_{T_0}, \partial_t \bar{u}_{T_0} \in C\big([-T_0, 0], L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)\big),$$

especially,

$$\bar{u}_{T_0} \in C\big([-T_0, 0], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)\big), \quad \partial_t \bar{u}_{T_0} \in C\big([-T_0, 0], L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)\big). \quad (4.7)$$

Notice that for $1 < \mu < p_0$, if $Q_0 \le \frac{p_0}{\mu - 1}$, there hold $p_2 \ge p_0$ and $\frac{p_0}{\mu} > p_1$; however, if $Q_0 > \frac{p_0}{\mu - 1}$, then $\frac{p_0}{\mu} < p_2 < p_0$ and thus we cannot get the L^{p_0} (only L^{p_2}) regularity of $\bar{u}_{T_0}$ with respect to the variable x from (4.5), which will lead to the difficulty in closing the $L^{p_0}-$ regularity argument on the solution u to the nonlinear problem (4.1). Consequently, we will restrict our consideration on the cases for $0 \le \mu \le 1$, or for $1 < \mu < p_0$ with $Q_0 \le \frac{p_0}{\mu - 1}$.

Collecting (4.5)-(4.7) yields that when $0 \le \mu \le 1$, or when $1 < \mu < p_0$ with $Q_0 \le \frac{p_0}{\mu - 1}$,

$$\bar{u}_{T_0} \in C\big([-T_0, 0], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)\big), \quad \partial_t \bar{u}_{T_0} \in C\big([-T_0, 0], L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)\big). \quad (4.8)$$

In order to solve (4.1) in $\{t \le 0\}$, we only require to consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 v_{T_0} - t^{2l-1} \Delta v_{T_0} = \chi_{T_0}(t)\big(f(t, x, \bar{u} + \bar{u}_{T_0} + v_{T_0}) - f(t, x, \bar{u})\big), \ \ (t, x) \in (-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ v_{T_0}(0, x) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

Indeed, if (4.9) is solved, then $u_{T_0} = \bar{u} + \bar{u}_{T_0} + v_{T_0}$ is a solution to the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 u_{T_0} - t^{2l-1}\Delta u_{T_0} = \chi_{T_0}(t) f(t,x,u_{T_0}), \quad (t,x) \in (-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u_{T_0}(0,x) = u_0(x), \end{cases}$$

namely, we solve the problem (4.1) for $(t,x) \in [-T_0, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

We will use the following iteration scheme to study the problem (4.9)

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 v_{T_0}^{k+1} - t^{2l-1}\Delta v_{T_0}^{k+1} = \chi_{T_0}(t)\big(f(t,x,\bar{u} + \bar{u}_{T_0} + v_{T_0}^k) - f(t,x,\bar{u})\big), \quad (t,x) \in (-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ v_{T_0}^{k+1}(0,x) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{4.10}$$

where $v_{T_0}^0(t,x) \equiv 0$.

For $k = 0$, $v_{T_0}^1$ is the solution to the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 v_{T_0}^1 - t^{2l-1}\Delta v_{T_0}^1 = \chi_{T_0}(t)\big(f(t,x,\bar{u} + \bar{u}_{T_0}) - f(t,x,\bar{u})\big), \quad (t,x) \in (-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ v_{T_0}^1(0,x) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.11}$$

Denote

$$I_0 \equiv \frac{1}{t}\chi_{T_0}(t)\big(f(t,x,\bar{u} + \bar{u}_{T_0}) - f(t,x,\bar{u})\big).$$

Since $\bar{u}_{T_0}(t,x) = \int_0^t \partial_\tau \bar{u}_{T_0}(\tau,x)d\tau$, we have from the condition (1.2) that

$$|I_0| \le \begin{cases} C\chi_{T_0}(t)\Big|\dfrac{1}{t}\displaystyle\int_0^t \partial_\tau \bar{u}_{T_0}(\tau,x)d\tau\Big|, & \text{when } 0 \le \mu \le 1, \\ C\chi_{T_0}(t)(1 + |\bar{u}|^{\mu-1} + |\bar{u}_{T_0}|^{\mu-1})\Big|\dfrac{1}{t}\displaystyle\int_0^t \partial_\tau \bar{u}_{T_0}(\tau,x)d\tau\Big|, & \text{when } 1 < \mu < p_0. \end{cases}$$

Now we analyze the regularity of I_0. First consider the case $1 < \mu < p_0$ with $1 < \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu - 1}$. In this case, $\bar{u} \in L^{p_0}(G_{T_0})$, $\bar{u}_{T_0}, \partial_t \bar{u}_{T_0} \in L^{p_2}(G_{T_0})$, which together with Hölder's inequality and Hardy's inequality derives that

$$I_0 \in L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}_-^{n+1}) + L^{p_2/\mu}(\mathbb{R}_-^{n+1}) + L^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}_-^{n+1}), \tag{4.12}$$

where and below $\dfrac{1}{r_1} = \dfrac{\mu - 1}{p_0} + \dfrac{1}{p_2} = \dfrac{2\mu - 1}{p_0} - \dfrac{1}{Q_0}$.

Since I_0 has compact support with respect to variables t and x, and in this case, $\min\{p_2, \dfrac{p_2}{\mu}, r_1\} = r_1$, we have that for any $1 < \gamma \le r_1$,

$$I_0 \in L^\gamma(\mathbb{R}_-^{n+1}), \quad \text{when } 1 < \mu < p_0 \ \text{ and } 1 < \frac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \le \frac{p_0}{\mu - 1}. \tag{4.13}$$

Similarly, we also have that

$$I_0 \in \begin{cases} L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-), & \text{for any } 1 < p \le p_2, \quad \text{if } 0 < \mu \le 1 \text{ and } 1 < \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0, \\ L^q(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-), & \text{for any } 1 < q < \infty, \quad \text{if } 0 < \mu \le 1 \text{ and } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} > Q_0, \\ L^\delta(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-), & \text{for any } 1 < \delta \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu - 1}, \quad \text{if } 1 < \mu < p_0 \text{ and } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} > Q_0, \\ L^\eta(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-), & \text{for any } 1 < \eta \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu}, \quad \text{if } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} = Q_0. \end{cases} \tag{4.14}$$

Based on (4.13)-(4.14), we then have from (4.11) and Theorem 3.1 with $m = 2l - 1$ and $\nu = 1$ that

(i) For $0 < \mu \le 1$,

$$v^1_{T_0} \in \begin{cases} C([-T_0, 0], L^q(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)) & \text{for } 1 < q < \infty, \quad \text{if } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} > Q_0, \text{ or if } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \text{ and } p_2 > Q_1, \\ C\big([-T_0, 0], L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\theta(\mathbb{R}^n)\big) & \text{for } 1 < p \le p_2 \text{ and } \dfrac{1}{\theta} \equiv \dfrac{1}{p_2} - \dfrac{1}{Q_1}, \quad \text{if } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \text{ and } p_2 < Q_1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\partial_t v^1_{T_0} \in \begin{cases} C([-T_0, 0], L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^\infty(G_{T_0}) & \text{for } 1 < q < \infty, \text{ if } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} > Q_0, \text{ or if } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \text{ and } p_2 > Q_1, \\ C\big([-T_0, 0], L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)\big) \cap L^\theta(G_{T_0}) & \text{for } 1 < p \le p_2, \quad \text{if } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \text{ and } 1 < p_2 < Q_1. \end{cases}$$

(ii) For $1 < \mu < p_0$,

$$v^1_{T_0} \in \begin{cases} C([-T_0, 0], L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)) & \text{for } 1 < p < \infty, \text{ if } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} > Q_0, \\ & \qquad \text{or if } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu - 1} \text{ and } r_1 > Q_1, \\ C([-T_0, 0], L^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\Theta(\mathbb{R}^n)) & \text{for } 1 < \gamma \le r_1, \dfrac{1}{\Theta} \equiv \dfrac{1}{r_1} - \dfrac{1}{Q_1}, \\ & \qquad \text{if } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu - 1} \text{ and } r_1 < Q_1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\partial_t v^1_{T_0} \in \begin{cases} C([-T_0, 0], L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^\infty(G_{T_0}) & \text{for } 1 < p < \infty, \text{ if } \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} > Q_0, \\ & \qquad \text{or if } 1 < \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu - 1}, r_1 > Q_1, \\ C([-T_0, 0], L^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^\Theta(G_{T_0}) & \text{for } 1 < \gamma \le r_1, \\ & \qquad \text{if } 1 < \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu - 1} \text{ and } 1 < r_1 < Q_1. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, when $\frac{p_0}{\mu} = Q_0$, or when $0 < \mu \le 1$ with $\frac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0$ and $p_2 = Q_1$, or when $1 < \mu < p_0$ with $\frac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \le \frac{p_0}{\mu - 1}$ and $r_1 = Q_1$, we have that

$$v^1_{T_0}, \partial_t v^1_{T_0} \in C([-T_0, 0], L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)) \quad \text{for any } 1 < q < \infty.$$

Therefore, collecting all the above analysis in (i)-(ii) yields

$$v^1_{T_0} \in C\Big((-\infty, 0], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)\Big), \ \ \partial_t v^1_{T_0} \in C\Big((-\infty, 0], L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)\Big), \tag{4.15}$$

when $0 < \mu \le 1$, or when $1 < \mu < p_0$ and $Q_0 \le \frac{p_0}{\mu - 1}$.

To study the problem (4.10), we denote by

$$I_k \equiv \frac{1}{t}\chi_{T_0}(t)\Big(f(t, x, \bar{u} + \bar{u}_{T_0} + v^k_{T_0}) - f(t, x, \bar{u})\Big).$$

We now derive the regularities of I_k under different restrictions on μ, l and p_0 in (1.2)-(1.3), whose classifications are based on the distinguished regularities of v_{T_0} and $\partial_t v_{T_0}$.

Define the set $\mathcal{M}_1$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_1 = \{g(t,x) : & \, g(t,x) \in C([-T_0, 0], L^q(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)), \\ & \partial_t g(t,x) \in C([-T_0, 0], L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^\infty(G_{T_0}), \quad |||g|||_1 + \tilde{|||}|\partial_t g|\tilde{|||}_1 \le 2\}, \\ & \text{for any } 1 < q < \infty,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$|||g|||_1 \equiv \|g\|_{C([-T_0,0], L^q(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|g\|_{C([-T_0,0], L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

and

$$\tilde{|||}|\partial_t g|\tilde{|||}_1 \equiv \|\partial_t g\|_{C([-T_0,0], L^q(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|\partial_t g\|_{L^\infty(G_{T_0})}.$$

In particular, for $g \in \mathcal{M}_1$, one has $g \in C([-T_0, 0], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap C^1([-T_0, 0], L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Case 1. $1 < \mu < p_0$ and $Q_0 < \frac{p_0}{\mu}$

In this case, for $v^k_{T_0} \in \mathcal{M}_1$, we have from (1.2) that

$$|I_k| \le C\chi_{T_0}(t)(1 + |\bar{u}|^{\mu-1} + |\bar{u}_{T_0}|^{\mu-1} + |v^k_{T_0}|^{\mu-1})\Big(|\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \partial_\tau \bar{u}_{T_0}(\tau, x)d\tau| + |\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \partial_\tau v^k_{T_0}(\tau, x)d\tau|\Big),$$

which, together with Hardy's inequality and the regularities of $\bar{u}, \bar{u}_{T_0}, v^k_{T_0}, \partial_t \bar{u}_{T_0}$ and $\partial_t v^k_{T_0}$ in G_{T_0} (that is, $\bar{u} \in L^{p_0}(G_{T_0})$ and $\bar{u}_{T_0}$, $\partial_t \bar{u}_{T_0}$, $v^k_{T_0}$, $\partial_t v^k_{T_0} \in L^\infty(G_{T_0})$), yields

$$I_k \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-) + L^{\frac{p_0}{\mu-1}}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-).$$

Since I_k has the compact support with respect to the variables t and x, we have

$$I_k \in L^\delta(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-) \text{ for any } 1 < \delta \le \frac{p_0}{\mu - 1}.$$

Noting that in this case, $\dfrac{p_0}{\mu-1} > \dfrac{p_0}{\mu} > Q_0 > Q_1$ hold, then we have from (4.10), (3.5) and (3.36)-(3.37) that $v_{T_0}^{k+1} \in \mathcal{M}_1$ for small $T_0 > 0$.

Case 2. $1 < \mu < p_0$, $\dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu-1}$ and $r_1 > Q_1$

In this case, for any $v_{T_0}^k \in \mathcal{M}_1$,

$$\bar{u} \in L^{p_0}(G_{T_0}),\ \bar{u}_{T_0} \in L^{p_2}(G_{T_0}),\ \partial_t \bar{u}_{T_0} \in L^{p_2}(G_{T_0}),\ v_{T_0}^k \in L^{\infty}(G_{T_0}),\ \partial_t v_{T_0}^k \in L^{\infty}(G_{T_0}),$$

and then as in Case 1, we have in G_{T_0},

$$I_k \in L^{p_2} + L^{\infty} + L^{r_1} + L^{p_2/\mu} + L^{p_2/(\mu-1)} + L^{p_0/(\mu-1)}.$$

Noting

$$\min\{p_2, r_1, \frac{p_2}{\mu}, \frac{p_2}{\mu-1}, \frac{p_0}{\mu-1}\} = r_1$$

and I_k has the compact support on the variables t and x, then

$$I_k \in L^{\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-) \qquad \text{for any } 1 < \gamma \le r_1.$$

Due to our assumption in this case, $r_1 > Q_1$ holds. Thus it follows from (3.36)-(3.37) and (3.5) in Theorem 3.1, and (4.10) that $v_{T_0}^{k+1} \in \mathcal{M}_1$ for small $T_0 > 0$.

Case 3. $0 < \mu \le 1$, $Q_0 > \dfrac{p_0}{\mu}$ and $p_2 > Q_1$

In this case, for $v_{T_0}^k \in \mathcal{M}_1$, the condition (1.2) implies that

$$|I_k| \le C\chi_{T_0}(t)\Big(\big|\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \partial_\tau \bar{u}_{T_0}(\tau, x)d\tau\big| + \big|\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \partial_\tau v_{T_0}^k(\tau, x)d\tau\big|\Big),$$

which yields

$$I_k \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-) + L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-) \subset L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-)$$

and then

$$I_k \in L^{p}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-) \quad \text{ for any } 1 < p \le p_2.$$

By $p_2 > Q_1$ from our assumption, then estimates (3.5), (3.36)-(3.37) in Theorem 3.1 and equation (4.10) that $v_{T_0}^{m+1} \in \mathcal{M}_1$ for small $T_0 > 0$.

Case 4. $0 < \mu \le 1$ and $Q_0 < \dfrac{p_0}{\mu}$

For $v_{T_0}^k \in \mathcal{M}_1$, we have

$$I_k \in L^{p}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-) \cap L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-) \quad \text{ for any } 1 < p < \infty,$$

thus, as in Case 3, $v_{T_0}^{k+1} \in \mathcal{M}_1$ for small $T_0 > 0$.

In order to get suitable regularities of I_k for some other left cases of μ, l and p_0, we now define the second set $\mathcal{M}_2$ as follows

$$\mathcal{M}_2 = \{g(t,x) : g \in C([-T_0, 0], L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^{\theta}(\mathbb{R}^n)), \partial_t g \in C([-T_0, 0], L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^{\theta}(G_{T_0}),$$

$$\|\!|g|\!\|_2 + \tilde{\|\!|}\partial_t g|\!\tilde{\|}_2 \le 2\},$$

where

$$\|\!|g|\!\|_2 \equiv \|g\|_{C([-T_0,0],L^p(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|g\|_{C([-T_0,0],L^\theta(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

and

$$\tilde{\|\!|}\partial_t g|\!\tilde{\|}_2 \equiv \|\partial_t g\|_{C([-T_0,0],L^p(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|\partial_t g\|_{L^\theta(G_{T_0})},$$

here $1 < p \le p_2$, $\dfrac{1}{\theta} = \dfrac{1}{p_2} - \dfrac{1}{Q_1}$. We now analyze the regularity of I_k when $v^k_{T_0} \in \mathcal{M}_2$.

Case 5. $0 < \mu \le 1$, $Q_0 > \dfrac{p_0}{\mu}$ and $Q_1 > p_2$

For $v^k_{T_0} \in \mathcal{M}_2$, we have from Hardy's inequality and the regularity of $\partial_t \bar{u}_{T_0} \in L^{p_2}(G_{T_0})$ and $\partial_t v^k_{T_0} \in L^\theta(G_{T_0})$ that

$$I_k \in L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-) + L^\theta(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-) \subset L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-)$$

and further

$$I_k \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_-) \quad \text{ for any } 1 < p \le p_2.$$

Due to $1 < p_2 < Q_1$ from our assumption in this case, we have from the estimates (3.36)-(3.37) and (3.4) in Theorem 3.1 together with (4.10) that $v^{k+1}_{T_0} \in \mathcal{M}_2$ for small $T_0 > 0$. Obviously, under the assumption in Case 5, if $g \in \mathcal{M}_2$, then

$$g \in C([-T_0,0],L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap C^1([-T_0,0],L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)).$$

As before, we require to define the third set $\mathcal{M}_3$

$$\mathcal{M}_3 = \{g(t,x) : g \in C([-T_0,0],L^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\Theta(\mathbb{R}^n)), \partial_t g \in C([-T_0,0],L^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^\Theta(G_{T_0}),$$
$$\|\!|g|\!\|_3 + \tilde{\|\!|}\partial_t g|\!\tilde{\|}_3 \le 2\},$$

where

$$\|\!|g|\!\|_3 \equiv \|g\|_{C([-T_0,0],L^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|g\|_{C([-T_0,0],L^\Theta(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

and

$$\tilde{\|\!|}\partial_t g|\!\tilde{\|}_3 \equiv \|\partial_t g\|_{C([-T_0,0],L^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|\partial_t g\|_{L^\Theta(G_{T_0})},$$

here $1 < \gamma \le r_1$, $\dfrac{1}{\Theta} \equiv \dfrac{1}{r_1} - \dfrac{1}{Q_1}$. We now derive the regularity of I_k in the following case.

Case 6. $1 < \mu < p_0$, $\dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu - 1}$ and $Q_1 > r_1$

At this moment, we have $\Theta > p_0$ and $r_1 > p_1$. Hence, in Case 6, if $g \in \mathcal{M}_3$, then

$$g \in C([-T_0,0],L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap C^1([-T_0,0],L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)),$$

and for $v^k_{T_0} \in \mathcal{M}_3$,

$$I_k \in L^{p_2} + L^\Theta + L^{r_1} + L^{p_2/\mu} + L^{\eta_1} + L^{\eta_2} + L^{\eta_3} + L^{\Theta/\mu},$$

where

$$\frac{1}{\eta_1} \equiv \frac{\mu-1}{\Theta} + \frac{1}{p_2}, \quad \frac{1}{\eta_2} \equiv \frac{\mu-1}{p_0} + \frac{1}{\Theta}, \quad \frac{1}{\eta_3} \equiv \frac{\mu-1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{\Theta}.$$

Noting that

$$\min\{p_2, \Theta, \frac{p_2}{\mu}, \frac{\Theta}{\mu}, r_1, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3\} = r_1,$$

then

$$I_k \in L^{\eta}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_{-}) \quad \text{ for any } 1 < \eta \le r_1.$$

This together with (3.4) and (3.36)-(3.37) in Theorem 3.1 yields $v^{m+1}_{T_0} \in \mathcal{M}_3$ for small $T_0 > 0$.

Finally, we treat the term I_k for the left cases of μ, l and p_0. To this end, as before, we define the fourth set $\mathcal{M}_4$

$$\mathcal{M}_4 = \{g(t,x) : \ g, \partial_t g \in C([-T_0, 0], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)), |||g|||_4 + \tilde{|||}\partial_t g|\tilde{||}_4 \le 2\},$$

where $|||g|||_4 = \|g\|_{C([-T_0,0],L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n))}$ and $\tilde{|||}\partial_t g|\tilde{||}_4 = \|\partial_t g\|_{C([-T_0,0],L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n))}$. We now distinguish the following three cases:

Case 7. $0 < \mu < p_0$ and $Q_0 = \dfrac{p_0}{\mu}$

Case 8. $1 < \mu < p_0$, $\dfrac{p_0}{\mu} < Q_0 \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu}$ and $Q_1 = r_1$

Case 9. $0 < \mu \le 1$, $Q_0 > \dfrac{p_0}{\mu}$ and $Q_1 = p_2$

By the analogous analysis as in the previous cases, we can obtain $v^{k+1}_{T_0} \in \mathcal{M}_4$ for the Case 7 -Case 9 when $T_0 > 0$ is small.

Next we show the convergence of the sequence $\{v^k_{T_0}\}$ in the corresponding spaces $\mathcal{M}_i$ $(1 \le i \le 4)$. Set $\dot{v}^{k+1}_{T_0} = v^{k+1}_{T_0} - v^k_{T_0}$, then it follows from (4.10) that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 \dot{v}^{k+1}_{T_0} - t^{2l-1}\Delta \dot{v}^{k+1}_{T_0} = \chi_{T_0}(t)\big(f(t,x,\bar{u}+\bar{u}_{T_0}+v^k_{T_0}) - f(t,x,\bar{u}+\bar{u}_{T_0}+v^{k-1}_{T_0})\big), \\ \dot{v}^{k+1}_{T}(0,x) = 0. \end{cases}$$

As in Case 1-Case 9, in the related spaces $\mathcal{M}_j$ $(1 \le j \le 4)$, we can obtain by (3.35)-(3.37) separately

$$|||\dot{v}^{k+1}_{T_0}|||_j + |||\partial_t \dot{v}^{k+1}_{T_0}|||_j \le C(T_0)|||\dot{v}^k_{T_0}|||_j, \tag{4.16}$$

where $C(T_0) \le \dfrac{1}{2}$ for small $T_0 > 0$. Therefore, one can derive from (4.16) that for small fixed $T_0 > 0$, there exists a function $v_T(t,x)$ such that $v^{k+1}_{T_0} \to v_{T_0}(t,x)$ in $C([-T_0,0], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap C^1([-T_0,0], L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and $v_{T_0} \in C([-T_0,0], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap C^1([-T_0,0], L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ solves (4.9). Therefore, $u = \bar{u} + \bar{u}_{T_0} + v_{T_0}$ solves the problem (4.1) for $(t,x) \in [-T_0, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, and we complete the proof of Theorem 4.1 □

Remark 4.1. *If the assumptions of* $0 \le \mu \le 1$ *or* $1 < \mu < p_0$ *with* $Q_0 \le \dfrac{p_0}{\mu - 1}$ *are violated, then we cannot use the standard iteration scheme (4.10) to derive the existence of the*

solution to the problem (4.9). Indeed, for example, when $1 < \mu < p_0$ *with* $Q_0 > \dfrac{p_0}{\mu - 1}$ *and* $Q_1 > \dfrac{p_1}{\mu - 1}$*, if the iteration scheme (4.10) does work, then it follows from Theorem 3.1 that for* $v_{T_0}^k \in L^{q_k}(\mathbb{R}_-^{n+1})$

$$v_{T_0}^{k+1} \in L^{q_{k+1}}(\mathbb{R}_-^{n+1}), \qquad \textit{where } \frac{1}{q_{k+1}} = \frac{\mu}{q_k} - \frac{1}{Q_1}.$$

Noticing that one has for $k \geq 1$

$$\frac{1}{q_{k+1}} - \frac{1}{q_k} = \mu^{k-1}\Big(\frac{1}{q_2} - \frac{1}{q_1}\Big) = \mu^k\Big(\frac{\mu - 1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{Q_1}\Big),$$

thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{q_k} =& \frac{\mu^k}{p_1} - \frac{\mu^k - 1}{(\mu - 1)Q_1} = \mu^k\Big(\frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{(\mu - 1)Q}\Big) + \frac{1}{(\mu - 1)Q_1} \\ \geq& \mu^k\Big(\frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{(\mu - 1)Q}\Big) \to +\infty \quad \textit{as } m \to +\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it seems that it is difficult for us to derive the uniform lower bound of $q_k > 1$ *for any* $k \in \mathbb{N}$*. This means that the standard iteration scheme (4.10) only works for finite steps.*

5 Solvability of (1.1) in the degenerate hyperbolic region $\{t \geq 0\}$

Based on Theorem 4.1 in §4, we consider the problem (1.1) in the degenerate hyperbolic region $\{t \geq 0\}$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 w - t^{2l-1}\Delta w = f(t, x, w), & (t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ w(0, x) = \varphi(x), \\ \partial_t w(0, x) = \psi(x), \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

where $\varphi(x) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $0 \leq s < \dfrac{n}{2}$, and $\psi(x) \equiv \partial_t u(0, x) \in L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, here $\partial_t u(0, x)$ comes from Theorem 4.1 in the degenerate elliptic part $\{t \leq 0\}$ of the problem (1.1). Our main result in this section is

Theorem 5.1. *Under the conditions (1.2)-(1.3), there exists a small constant* $T_0 > 0$ *such that the problem (5.1) has a unique local solution* $w(t, x) \in C([0, T], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ *when* $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$*, or when* $1 < \mu < p_0$ *with* $Q_0 \leq \dfrac{p_0}{\mu - 1}$.

Proof. We first consider the following linear problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 w_1 - t^{2l-1}\Delta w_1 = 0, \quad (t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ w_1(0, x) = \varphi(x), \\ \partial_t w_1(0, x) = \psi(x). \end{cases} \tag{5.2}$$

By [26] or Lemma 2.2 in [19], we know that the problem (5.2) has a unique solution w_1, which can be expressed as follows

$$w_1(t,x) = V_1(t,D_x)\varphi(x) + V_2(t,D_x)\psi(x), \tag{5.3}$$

where the pseudo-differential operator $V_j(t,D_x)$ has the symbol $V_j(t,|\xi|)$ for $j=1,2$,

$$\begin{cases} V_1(t,|\xi|) = e^{-\frac{z}{2}}\Phi(\frac{2l-1}{2(2l+1)},\frac{2l-1}{2l+1};z), \\ V_2(t,|\xi|) = te^{-\frac{z}{2}}\Phi(\frac{2l+3}{2(2l+1)},\frac{2l+3}{2l+1};z), \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

here the confluent hypergeometric functions $\Phi(\frac{2l-1}{2(2l+1)},\frac{2l-1}{2l+1};z)$ and $\Phi(\frac{2l+3}{2(2l+1)},\frac{2l+3}{2l+1};z)$ are analytic functions of z with $z=\dfrac{4i}{2l+1}t^{\frac{2l+1}{2}}|\xi|$. Moreover, for sufficiently large $|z|$,

$$|\Phi(\frac{2l-1}{2(2l+1)},\frac{2l-1}{2l+1};z)| \le C|z|^{-\frac{2l-1}{2(2l+1)}}\big(1+O\big(|z|^{-1}\big)\big),$$

and

$$|\Phi(\frac{2l+3}{2(2l+1)},\frac{2l+3}{2l+1};z)| \le C|z|^{-\frac{2l+3}{2(2l+1)}}\big(1+O\big(|z|^{-1}\big)\big). \tag{5.5}$$

In addition, by Lemma 3.2 in [19] and Sobolev's embedding theorem, one has

$$\|V_1(t,D_x)\varphi(x)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C\|V_1(t,D_x)\varphi(x)\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C\|\varphi\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \tag{5.6}$$

and

$$\|\partial_t V_1(t,D_x)\varphi(x)\|_{L^{q_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C\|\partial_t V_1(t,D_x)\varphi(x)\|_{H^{s-\frac{2l+3}{2(2l+1)}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C\|\varphi\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \tag{5.7}$$

where $\dfrac{1}{q_0} = \dfrac{1}{2} - \dfrac{1}{n}\left(s - \dfrac{2l+3}{2(2l+1)}\right)$.

On the other hand, it follows from the analytic property of $\Phi(\frac{2l+3}{2(2l+1)},\frac{2l+3}{2l+1};z)$ on the variable z and the estimate (5.5) that there exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$|z|^{\frac{2}{2l+1}}|V_2(t,|\xi|)| \le Ct$$

and further

$$|V_2(t,|\xi|)| \le C|\xi|^{-\frac{2}{2l+1}}. \tag{5.8}$$

It is noted that $\psi(x) = \partial_t u(0,x) \in L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and

$$1 < p_1 < p_0 < +\infty, \quad \frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{p_0} = \frac{2}{n(2l+1)}.$$

This, together with (5.8) and Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev's inequality, yields

$$\|V_2(t,D_x)\psi(x)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C\|\psi\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \tag{5.9}$$

Therefore, by (5.3), (5.6) and (5.9), we obtain

$$w_1(t,x) \in C\big([0,T], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)\big). \tag{5.10}$$

Set $v(t,x) = w(t,x) - w_1(t,x)$, then it follows from (5.1) that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 v - t^{2l-1}\Delta v = f(t,x,v+w_1), \qquad (t,x) \in [0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^n, \\ v(0,x) = 0, \qquad \partial_t v(0,x) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{5.11}$$

For suitably chosen constant $T > 0$, we define a set $\mathcal{M}$:

$$\mathcal{M} = \{v \in C\big([0,T], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)\big) : \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|v(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le 2\}.$$

And then we define a mapping $\mathcal{T}$ as follows

$$\mathcal{T}(v)(t,x) = \int_0^t \Big(V_2(t,D_x)V_1(\tau,D_x) - V_1(t,D_x)V_2(\tau,D_x)\Big) f(\tau,x,v+w_1)d\tau.$$

It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{T}(v)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Big(\partial_t^2 - t^{2l-1}\Delta\Big)\mathcal{T}(v) = f(t,x,v+w_1), \qquad (t,x) \in [0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^n, \\ \mathcal{T}(v)(0,x)) = 0, \\ \partial_t\mathcal{T}(v)(0,x) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{5.12}$$

By Theorem 3.1 in [26], we have that for any $g \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $1 < p < \infty$

$$\|V_1(t,D_x)g(x)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \tag{5.13}$$

and

$$\|V_2(t,D_x)g(x)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le Ct\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \tag{5.14}$$

Next we show that the mapping $\mathcal{T}$ maps $\mathcal{M}$ into itself and the mapping $\mathcal{T}$ is contractible for small $T > 0$. If so, then we can get the solvability of (5.11). For this purpose, we will distinguish two cases as follows.

Case 1. $0 \le \mu \le 1$:

in this case, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}(v)(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le & Ct\int_0^t \|f(\tau,v+w_1)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)}d\tau \quad \text{(by (5.13) and (5.14))} \\ \le & Ct\int_0^t \|f(\tau,v+w_1)\|_{L^{p_0/\mu}(\mathbb{R}^n)}d\tau \quad \text{(by Hölder's inequality)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\leq & Ct\int_0^t \big(1+\|v(\tau,\cdot)+w_1(\tau,\cdot))\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\big)d\tau \quad \text{(by (1.2))}\\
\leq & Ct^2\Big(1+\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|v(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)}+\|w_1(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\Big). \qquad (5.15)
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $1<\mu<p_0$ and $Q_0\leq\dfrac{p_0}{\mu-1}$:

in this case, one has $p_1\leq\dfrac{p_0}{\mu}<p_0$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{T}(v)(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq & C\int_0^t \|f(\tau,v+w_1)\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)}d\tau \quad \text{(by (5.11) and (5.13))}\\
\leq & C\int_0^t \|f(\tau,v+w_1)\|_{L^{p_0/\mu}(\mathbb{R}^n)}d\tau \quad \text{(by Hölder's inequality)}\\
\leq & C\int_0^t \big(1+\|v(\tau,\cdot)+w_1(\tau,\cdot))\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\big)d\tau \quad \text{(by (1.2))}\\
\leq & Ct\Big(1+\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|v(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)}+\|w_1(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\Big). \qquad (5.16)
\end{aligned}$$

From (5.6), (5.9) and (5.16), we see that for small $T>0$, $\mathcal{T}(v)(t,x)\in C([0,T],L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|\mathcal{T}(v)(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\leq C_{p_0}T\Big(1+\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|v(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)}+\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|w_1(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\Big)\leq 2, \qquad (5.17)$$

which implies that $\mathcal{T}$ maps $\mathcal{M}$ into itself.

In addition, for any $v_1,v_2\in\mathcal{M}$, as argued in (5.16), one can obtain for small $T>0$

$$\|\mathcal{T}(v_1)(t,\cdot)-\mathcal{T}(v_2)(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\leq\frac{1}{2}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|v_1(t,\cdot)-v_2(t,\cdot)\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \qquad (5.18)$$

Therefore, by (5.17)-(5.18) and the contraction map principle, we complete the proof of Theorem 5.1. □

Remark 5.1. *If the initial data $u(0,x)=\varphi_0(x)\in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in (1.1) for $n=2,3$ and $s\geq 0$ is given, we can remove all the assumptions in (1.2)-(1.3). Indeed, from the proof of Theorem 4.1, we can derive that $u(t,x),\partial_t u(t,x)\in L^\infty([-T_0,0]\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some fixed constant $T_0>0$ without the assumptions (1.2)-(1.3), which obviously means $(u(0,x),\partial_t u(0,x))=(\varphi_0(x),\varphi_1(x))\in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In addition, by [25], one has the following formula*

$$\begin{aligned}
w(t,x)=&2^{2-2\gamma}\frac{\Gamma(2\gamma)}{\Gamma^2(\gamma)}\int_0^1 v_{\varphi_0}(\phi(t)s,x)(1-s^2)^{\gamma-1}ds\\
&+2^{2\gamma}\frac{\Gamma(2-2\gamma)}{\Gamma^2(1-\gamma)}t\int_0^1 v_{\varphi_1}(\phi(t)s,x)(1-s^2)^{-\gamma}ds
\end{aligned}$$

when $w(t,x)$ is a solution to the equation $\partial_t^2 w-t^{2l-1}\Delta w=0$ with $(w(0,x),\partial_t w(0,x))=(\varphi_0(x),\,\varphi_1(x))$, where $\gamma=\dfrac{2l-1}{2(2l+1)}$, $\phi(t)=\dfrac{2}{2l+1}t^{\frac{2l+1}{2}}$, and v_φ denotes by the solution to

the wave equation $\partial_t^2 v - \Delta v = 0$ with $(v(0,x), \partial_t v(0,x)) = (\varphi(x), 0)$. It is well-known that $v \in L^\infty([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ holds for $n = 2, 3$ and any $T > 0$ when $\varphi(x) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Based on this, one easily knows $w(t,x) \in L^\infty([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ $(n = 2, 3)$. Therefore, by a simpler proof than that in Theorem 5.1, we can locally solve the problem (1.1) with no the assumptions (1.2)-(1.3) when $n = 2, 3$, and further $u(t,x) \in L^\infty([-T_0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ can be derived and (1.1) is solved.

6 Proof of Theorem 1.1.

In this section, based on Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 5.1, we will complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, by Theorem 4.1, we know that (1.1) is solvable in the degenerate elliptic region $(t,x) \in [-T_0, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, moreover, the corresponding solution $u(t,x)$ satisfies

$$u(t,x) \in C\Big([-T_0, 0], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)\Big), \quad \partial_t u(t,x) \in C\Big([-T_0, 0], L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)\Big). \tag{6.1}$$

On the other hand, by the initial data $(u(0,x), \partial_t u(0,x))$ given in (6.1), it follows from Theorem 5.1 that the problem (1.1) admits a unique solution in the degenerate hyperbolic region $(t,x) \in [0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ for small constant $T_0 > 0$, which satisfies

$$u(t,x) \in C([0, T_0], L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)). \tag{6.2}$$

Therefore, combining (6.1) with (6.2) yields Theorem 1.1. □

References

[1] J. Barros-Neto, I. M. Gelfand, *Fundamental solutions for the Tricomi operator. I, II*, Duke Math. J. 98 (3): 465-483 (1999); 111 (3): 561-584 (2002)

[2] M. Beals, *Singularities due to cusp interactions in nonlinear waves, Nonlinear hyperbolic equations and field theory* (Lake Como, 1990), 36-51, Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., 253, Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow, 1992.

[3] M. Dreher, M. Reissig, *Propagation of mild singularities for semilinear weakly hyperbolic equations*, J. Anal. Math. 82, 233-266 (2000)

[4] M. Dreher, M. Reissig, *Local solutions of fully nonlinear weakly hyperbolic differential equations in Sobolev spaces*, Hokkaido Math. J. 27, no. 2, 337-381 (1998)

[5] M. Dreher, I. Witt, *Energy estimates for weakly hyperbolic systems of the first order*, Commun. Contemp. Math. 7, no. 6, 809-837 (2005)

[6] A. Erdelyi, W. Magnus, F. Oberhettinger, F.G. Tricomi, *Higher Transcendental Functions*, Vol.1, New York, Toronto and London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1953.

[7] Han Qing, K. Marcus, *On the local isometric embedding in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of surfaces with Gaussian curvature of mixed sign*, Comm. Anal. Geom. 18, no. 4, 649-704 (2010)

[8] Hong Jiaxing, Li Goquan, *L^p estimates for a class of integral operators*, J. Partial. Diff. Eqs., 9, 343-364 (1996)

[9] Hong Jia Xing, C. Zuily, *L^p and Hölder estimates for a class of degenerate elliptic boundary value problems. Application to the Monge-Ampre equation*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 16, no. 6-7, 997-1031 (1991)

[10] L. Hörmander, *The analysis of linear partial differential operators I*, Springer-Verlag, 1983.

[11] J. U. Kim, *An L^p a priori estimate for the Tricomi equation in the upper half space*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 351 (11), 4611-4628 (1999)

[12] A. G. Kuz'min, *Nonclassical equations of mixed type and their applications in gas dynamics, translated and revised from the Russian by the author*, Internat. Ser. Numer. Math., Vol. 109, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1992.

[13] D. Lupo, D. D. Monticelli, K. R. Payne, *Spectral theory for linear operators of mixed type and applications to nonlinear Dirichlet problems*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 37, no. 9, 1495-1516 (2012)

[14] D. Lupo, C. S. Morawetz, K. R. Payne, *On closed boundary value problems for equations of mixed elliptic-hyperbolic type*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 60, no. 9, 1319-1348 (2007)

[15] D. Lupo, K. R. Payne, *Spectral bounds for Tricomi problems and application to semilinear existence and existence with uniqueness results*, J. Differential Equations 184, no. 1, 139-162 (2002)

[16] D. Lupo, K. R. Payne, *Critical exponents for semilinear equations of mixed elliptic-hyperbolic and degenerate types*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 56, no. 3, 403-424 (2003)

[17] R. Monti, *Sobolev inequalities for weighted gradients*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, no. 10-12, 1479-1504 (2006)

[18] C. S. Morawetz, *Mixed equations and transonic flow*, J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ. 1, no.1, 1-26 (2004)

[19] Ruan Zhuoping, Witt Ingo, Yin Huicheng, *On the existence and cusp singularity of solutions to semilinear generalized Tricomi equations with discontinuous initial data*, Communications in Contemporary Mathematics, DOI: 10.1142/S021- 9199714500 28X, 2014.

[20] Ruan Zhuoping, Witt Ingo, Yin Huicheng, *The existence and singularity structures of low regularity solutions to higher order degenerate hyperbolic equations*, J. Differential Equations 256, no. 2, 407-460 (2014)

[21] Song Qiaozhen, Lu Ying, Shen Jianzhong, Wang Lihe, *Regularity of a class of degenerate elliptic equations*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) 10, no. 3, 645-667 (2011)

[22] E. M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 30, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1970.

[23] G. Watson, *A Treatise on the Theory of Bessel Functions*, second ed. Cambridge Univ. Press, England, 1966.

[24] Xu Ning, Yin Huicheng, *The weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimate on the solution of the Gellerstedt equation in the upper half space*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 332, no. 2, 1148-1164 (2007)

[25] K. Yagdjian, *A note on the fundamental solution for the Tricomi-type equation in the hyperbolic domain*, J. Differential Equations 206, no. 1, 227-252 (2004)

[26] K. Yagdjian, *Global existence for the n-dimensional semilinear Tricomi-type equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 31, no. 4-6, 907-944 (2006)